

The hearings will begin at 10:30 a. m. in room 445, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Monday, March 18, 1946, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled a hearing on the bill (H. R. 5234) to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in matters relating to social protection, and for other purposes.

The hearing will begin at 10 a. m. and will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will begin hearings on an omnibus flood control authorization bill on Monday, April 8, 1946, at 10 a. m. The hearings will continue daily except Saturday up to and including Friday, April 19.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, April 9, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on projects to be reported out in an omnibus river and harbor authorization bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1135. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to eliminate the restriction on the number of lots which may be acquired by settlers in the town site of Wadsworth, Nev.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1136. A letter from the Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting the first report of the Interagency Policy Committee on Rubber; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1137. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit the sale of liquor to Indians outside Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1138. A letter from the Chairman, President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, transmitting its quarterly estimate of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1139. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the official operations of the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1140. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1141. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 26, 1945, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Absecon Inlet, N. J., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 16, 1935, February 27, 1936, February 28, 1941, and a resolution of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on May 12, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 504); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 5574. A bill to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of \$1,500,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of \$500,000 now authorized; without amendment (Rept. No. 1716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:
H. R. 5781. A bill to give enlisted personnel the same benefits as officers as to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:
H. R. 5782. A bill to authorize the elimination of the so-called pauper clause from Veterans' Administration application forms for hospitalization; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):
H. R. 5783. A bill authorizing the restoration to tribal ownership of certain lands upon the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 5784. A bill relating to eligibility for examination for foreign-service officers of persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STIGLER:
H. R. 5785. A bill to provide Government protection to widows and children of deceased World War I and World War II veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5786. A bill to provide increases of pension or compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:
H. R. 5787. A bill to require the registration of persons engaged in lobbying and to require an accounting of contributions received for the purpose of influencing legislation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:
H. R. 5788. A bill to authorize the naturalization of M. R. Bhagwat; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DEWART:
H. R. 5789. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Lyle M. Lockman; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 5790. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Harry Paulson; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:
H. R. 5791. A bill to refund certain moneys paid into the civil-service retirement and disability fund by the late John H. McGrath; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McGEHEE:
H. R. 5792. A bill for the relief of certain postmasters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON:
H. R. 5793. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John A. Hogg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROE of New York:
H. R. 5794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susan W. Roe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:
H. R. 5795. A bill for the relief of William A. Cornell; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1706. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Lt. Col. Darwin S. Holton, Thornton, Tex., favoring House bill 5204; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1707. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Geological Society of Washington, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their endorsement of Senate bill 1717; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1708. Also, petition of the Independence Teachers Association, of Independence, Kans., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requested legislation which would include members of the teachers' profession under social security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father John J. Molloy, Order of Preachers, Dominican House of Studies, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Almighty and benignly provident God the Father, graciously bless the Representatives of the United States to whom Thou hast granted the privilege of a share in Thy legislative power. From their sincere hearts Thou has accepted a solemn promise to serve with unselfish effort Thy American children and to develop and preserve those children as virtuous citizens.

Almighty and omniscient God, we perceive that Thou has permitted our beloved Nation to be the solid buttress in a bomb-gutted world whose rubble is red-dened with the blood of American youth. Thou hast chosen us to be the stabilizing leader in a society of nations stumbling after permanent peace. This country most humbly beseeches Thee for light and strength to meet its tremendous responsibility.

All-loving God, tenderly grant our Representatives the grace to perceive Thy designs for the United States and the world. These they will know if they assiduously and unswervingly follow Thy Divine Son, Jesus Christ, who said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life," and if they heed the inspirations of the Triune God—the spirit of truth and love.

Teach them the prudent way and grant that, after discovering it, they will

follow it. Teach them the prudent way, so that they will be protected from rashness and from disloyalty to Thy interests and those of Thy people. Teach them the truth of justice, so that they will fulfill their sacred obligations to recognize, protect, and further the rights of American citizens and of all other human beings. Teach them the life of courage, so that they will virtuously safeguard what has been gained by prudence and justice.

Guided by these virtues, Thy Representatives will serve Thee, serve Thy American children, and lead them as virtuous citizens to Thee, the final end and eternal beginning of all mankind.

Almightily and benignly provident God the Father, through the infinitely powerful advocacy of God the Son and God the Holy Ghost, graciously grant these blessings to the Representatives of the United States. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 15, 1946, was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

MARCH 11, 1946.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Confirming my verbal conversation with you the other day, I would appreciate it if you would withdraw my name from the list of members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy for this year, and appoint someone else, as it will be impossible for me to serve this year.

I have enjoyed it in the past and would like to serve occasionally again in the future.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely,

LANSDALE G. SASSER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

THE SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy to fill the existing vacancy thereon the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ROWAN.

THE LATE JOHN BUELL SNYDER

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a eulogy to our deceased colleague, JOHN BUELL SNYDER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, when our beloved and distinguished colleague, JOHN BUELL SNYDER, died, I was not in Washington but sick at my home in North Carolina, and I am taking this opportunity to join with other colleagues in the expression of deep and abiding sorrow in the untimely death of an outstanding citizen of the great State of

Pennsylvania and a brave and fearless Member of this distinguished body. By profession Dr. SNYDER was a school teacher; he had mingled with youth and observed the freaks and foibles of guileless childhood until his life had become a reflection of the simple and noble traits of mankind brought to him by his contact with childhood and a deep sense of understanding of human nature.

I have been intimately associated with Dr. SNYDER officially and personally for 5 years, and I never heard him criticize or speak unkindly of a human being; he was often perplexed in dealing with official matters and sometimes himself criticized in the heat of controversy, but those who were impatient and rude to him were never wounded by a dart of resentment or received a reproach they often merited. BUELL SNYDER was a good man, he loved his fellow man and was ever ready to accord to those he contacted consideration, courtesy, and favor; he was not a coward in any respect and his sensibility had never been deadened or blunted by the violation of Nature's laws. I never heard him say a word or tell a story that could not have been spoken with propriety in a group of most refined ladies. He lived to the border of old age full of enthusiasm concerning whatever he undertook and was an inspiration to those whom he contacted in the duties assigned to him.

Dr. SNYDER was proud of the position occupied by him in this House; he filled every duty with promptness, and his plans of procedure and investigation were a counterpart of those he adopted in his schoolroom; he was never arbitrary and had profound respect for those with whom he disagreed in the performance of his duty. In fact, he was a true gentleman in every respect. He was gentle, modest, courteous, slow to take offense and never giving it; he harbored no qualities which excited the antagonism of his fellow Members of Congress. The tribute paid Congressman SNYDER here in this Hall, will gladden the hearts of those whom he loved, and confirm the wisdom of a fine constituency who chose him as their Representative here, and will always be a part of the great history of this Nation.

I assert, without fear of contradiction, that no official of this government cooperated more fully with the program which brought renowned success to our Army in the recent war than our deceased colleague, Dr. SNYDER. He labored unceasingly to fully acquaint himself with the needs and the equipment of our fighting forces and traveled throughout this country and in foreign areas seeking information with which to equip himself to perform the duties assigned to him. The acquisition of this knowledge made good his leadership and inspired the confidence of his fellow colleagues who served with him on the War Appropriations Committee.

I cannot refrain from speaking of one of the many characteristics which adorned the life of our departed friend. He loved the beautiful things of life, and I am told that his schoolroom, his home, and his office were filled with rare collections of pictures, bric-a-brac, and instruments of ingenious workmanship;

these things he enjoyed and his friends enjoyed and they brought rainbow hues and enduring joys to his whole life.

It has been well said that "beauty is a quality of divinity, and to live much with the beautiful is to live close to the divine. The more we see of beauty, in nature, in life, in man and child, in work and rest, in the outward and inward world, the more we see of God."

In my opinion, a great character has slipped away from us and received his reward. I once asked Dr. SNYDER how he came to be elected to Congress in a politically hostile district. His reply was, "I went to see the boys and girls whom I taught and requested their support, they elected me and have kept me here." What a tribute. It cannot be excelled. I count the friendship of BUELL SNYDER one of the rare jewels of my life. May God's benedictions ever guide and keep his family and his loved ones.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial appearing in the Daily Oklahoman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEWART addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PACE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the president of the American Merchant Marine Institute to Senator HATCH on the St. Lawrence waterway.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 430, Rept. No. 1748), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a thorough investigation of all the circumstances with respect to the disposition of the charges of espionage and the possession of documents stolen from secret Government files which were made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation against the following individuals: Philip J. Jaffe, Kate L. Mitchell,

John Stewart Service, Emmanuel Sigurd Larson, Andrew Roth, and Mark Gayn.

The Committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems necessary.

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, records, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of a news release.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. IZAC asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the March issue of Naval Affairs.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the food situation.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier, More UNO "Bunk."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each articles and editorials. I am informed by the Public Printer that one extension will exceed two pages of the RECORD but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extensions may be made.

There was no objection.

SURVEY OF MILITARY REQUIREMENTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a resolution the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and I have introduced, reaffirming this country's determination to meet its full responsibility in world affairs and creating a joint committee of five Members of the Senate and five of the House to investigate the number and character of the forces which we must raise and maintain for that and other necessary purposes and the measures which should be taken to insure that such forces are provided.

Among other things, the committee would be charged with recommending any changes in existing laws and the practices of the armed services which may be needed to spur recruitments through voluntary enlistments and with advising whether the Selective Service System should be extended pending placing the recruitment program on a completely voluntary basis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the text of the resolution and a statement prepared by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and myself, including the names of 24 of our colleagues who join us in the sponsorship of this resolution. I earnestly ask that the attention of the House be given to this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The text of the statement and resolution follow:

JOINT STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS HAYS, DEMOCRAT, ARKANSAS, AND REPRESENTATIVE CLIFFORD P. CASE, REPUBLICAN, NEW JERSEY, ON THE INTRODUCTION OF THE ATTACHED RESOLUTION

If the efforts to establish and maintain a peaceful world are to succeed, the United States, together with all other peace-loving nations, must meet its full share of responsibility to that end. We are confident that the people of the United States recognize and accept such responsibility, and, fully informed as to the relevant facts, will give determined and continuous support to all measures necessary to be taken by our Government in relation thereto.

That responsibility requires, among other things, that the United States shall furnish its quota of the forces necessary to make effective the power of the United Nations Organization and shall maintain sufficient forces for the occupation of enemy territory for such time as may be necessary.

We recognize that conscripted service in peacetime is contrary to our traditions and repugnant to the great majority of the people, but it is unthinkable that the United States should be compelled to dishonor any of its obligations or commitments or to withdraw from full participation in world affairs, or that it should endanger its own security.

It is the duty of Congress to determine what action is necessary and to see that it is taken. We must proceed with the greatest possible dispatch, yet we must also act wisely and on the basis of full knowledge and the best advice which can be had on the difficult and technical questions involved. For that reason, we are joining today in the introduction of the attached concurrent resolution.

The resolution would create a joint committee of the Senate and of the House to investigate fully the number and character of the forces which are necessary for the purposes above-mentioned and such other forces as are required for our own security and for the fulfillment of our obligations and commitments abroad. The committee would further investigate whether under existing laws and regulations and the present practices of the armed services such forces can be recruited through voluntary enlistments, and, if not, what changes in such laws, regulations and practices are necessary to insure that they can be so recruited and maintained. The committee would also investigate whether it is necessary that the Selective Service System be temporarily extended, pending placing of the recruiting program on

a completely voluntary basis, and, if so, for how long and upon what terms and conditions it should be extended; we cannot risk the disintegration of our forces while the voluntary program is getting under way.

The committee would be directed to report to the Congress the results of its investigations and its recommendations thereon from time to time, to make at least a tentative report by April 15, 1946, and to make its complete and final report by October 15, 1946.

The problems involved cover a number of fields and embrace matters within the jurisdiction of not one but several of the standing committees of each House. For that reason, and because of the necessity for the most expeditious action, it is appropriate, and indeed necessary, that the matter be handled by a special joint committee of both Houses rather than their regular standing committees.

We emphasize that the resolution deals with the question of the recruiting and maintenance of forces in active service. It has no relation to the question of compulsory military training. As General Eisenhower emphasized in his statement to the Members of Congress on January 15, 1946, "the President's program on universal military training stipulates training only, it does not provide for any service."

The following Members of the House have authorized us to state that the resolution has their wholehearted support and we are introducing it on their behalf as well as our own: SHERMAN ADAMS, New Hampshire; AUGUSTUS W. BENNET, New York; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; ALBERT M. COLE, Kansas; J. M. COMES, Texas; EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, Illinois; CLAIR ENGLE, California; HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Oregon; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio; ROBERT HALE, Maine; T. MILLET HAND, New Jersey; OREN HARRIS, Arkansas; EDWARD J. HART, New Jersey; CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, Massachusetts; JOHN W. HESLTON, Massachusetts; WALT HORAN, Washington; WALTER H. JUDD, Minnesota; JOHN E. LYLE, Texas; MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana; JOHN W. MURPHY, Pennsylvania; J. PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee; HARRY L. TOWE, New Jersey; JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas; VICTOR WICKERSHAM, Oklahoma.

We regret that time did not permit us to consult with a greater number of our colleagues before the introduction of the resolution as we are certain that the great majority of the Members of Congress will favor its adoption and would gladly have joined in sponsoring its introduction if it had been possible for us to bring it to their attention.

BROOKS HAYS,
Fifth District, Arkansas.*
CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Sixth District, New Jersey.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress declares that it recognizes and accepts the full share of responsibility resting upon the United States for the establishment and maintenance of a peaceful world and that this responsibility will require the furnishing of our share of the forces necessary to make effective the power of the United Nations Organization, and also the maintenance, so long as may be necessary, of adequate forces for the occupation of enemy territory;

SEC. 2. That the Congress is confident that the people of the United States likewise recognize and accept such responsibility and, when fully informed as to the relevant facts, will give determined and continuous support to all measures necessary to be taken by this Government in relation thereto;

SEC. 3. That in the light of our democratic traditions it appears desirable that the forces necessary for the foregoing purposes, as well

* The Selective Training and Service Act, as amended, expires on May 15, 1946.

as all other active forces which the United States may require in time of peace for its own security and for the fulfillment of its obligations and policies abroad, should consist of personnel recruited through voluntary enlistments; and the demobilization of the wartime forces should be completed and the operations of the Selective Service System terminated at the earliest possible date consistent with the security of the United States and its ability to fulfill its obligations and commitments aforesaid;

Sec. 4. That a joint committee is hereby established, to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President pro tempore, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, which committee shall proceed to investigate fully—

(a) The number and character of the forces which must be raised and maintained for each of the purposes hereinabove mentioned;

(b) Whether, under existing laws and regulations and the present practices of the armed services, such forces can be recruited solely through voluntary enlistments and, if not, what changes should be made in such laws, regulations, and practices to insure that such forces can be so recruited and maintained;

(c) Whether it is necessary that the Selective Service System be temporarily extended, pending the placing of this resolution, on a completely voluntary basis; and if so, for how long and upon what terms and conditions it should be extended; and

(d) Such other matters as it may deem relevant to the purposes of this resolution, and to report from time to time to the Senate and to the House of Representatives the results of such investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, the committee's first report to be made not later than April 15, 1946, and its complete and final report not later than October 15, 1946;

Sec. 5. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to exercise the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection; the committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members;

Sec. 6. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words;

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties; and

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, President Truman and his administration are not reducing the number of Federal pay-rollers now that the war is over but have inflated the number by adding, during the month of January, an increase of 34,569 employees to the old line bureaucratic departments.

The citizens and taxpayers will be amazed to learn that since the cessation of hostilities in August 1945, the old line departments and agencies have actually increased their number of employees by 140,000 people. These figures are official.

The only reduction in Federal employment which has taken place during the past 6 months in continental United States has been the 745,000 employees who worked for the Federal Government in the shipyards, arsenals, and ammunition plants. Naturally, these laborers have quit and gone into other employment with the curtailment of military construction.

Mr. Speaker, it is now apparent that the President and those in the executive department do not intend to reduce and demobilize bureaucracy here in Washington. It seems apparent that they intend to keep this political machine built up to its millions in strength as a permanent bureaucracy of the administration in power. The purpose can be none other than to attempt to reelect a New Deal Congress in November. It has another purpose, however, of adding billions to the national debt and adding to the danger of inflation.

The taxpayers of the country who must bear the financial load should be kept informed that the present administration has not and apparently does not intend to give the taxpayers relief by separating from the pay roll a million five hundred thousand people who are not needed in the Government today.

If the administration would give its support to Congress, the Congress can and will do the job.

LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, you have noticed in the morning Post the opposition to the loan to Britain. I, too, am opposed to that loan to Britain. With a national debt of \$279,000,000,000 I just want to know where you are going to get the money. With the taxpayers having their noses to the grindstone now they have about all they can handle, with reconversion held up by strikes, the regulation of our people to the point of strangulation, and the New Deal still suggesting illogical legislation. With Mr. Hannegan now inviting all the members of the Democratic Party for dinner to try to get them to put that New Deal

legislation through the mill, I do not know why we could not be invited to that dinner, too, because I should like to have my say there and see if we are going to agree to Mr. Hannegan's request. Oh, Congress wake up—save your freedom, save your liberty, save America, preserve our Constitution. Preserve our way of life. Oh, wake up, wake up, or it will be too late to save our country from the New Deal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in three instances and include several editorials.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her own remarks and include a radio address she delivered on Saturday night.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one, to include a newspaper article; and in the other to include two letters.

HENRY A. WALLACE AND SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers of the last 5 days, Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of the Department of Commerce, would have us believe that he was only drooling and driveling from the mouth, and not giving a factual, official report, when last November he said that the automobile industry could stand a 25 percent increase in wages without increasing prices. It is a poor alibi for a prophet proven false.

Nevertheless, President Truman and millions of Americans believed and acted on that palaver, plunging us in the longest and most costly strike epidemic in our national history, setting back our reconversion at least 6 months, and adding dangerous fuel to the inflation threat.

In the same category of inanity are the statements of Henry A. Wallace and Sidney Hillman that we would have eight to ten million unemployed in the first quarter of 1946, and the claim of Chester A. Bowles and Paul A. Porter that production, the first cure and preventative of inflation, can be accomplished by keeping prices down to 1941 levels.

Members of Congress and the American people cannot stop this drool and drivel, but as these false doctrines are being exploded more of the people can and will begin to do their own thinking instead of letting these false leaders do their thinking for them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter which he received from James C. Green, secretary-treasurer of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation of Madison, Wis.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUCHINCLOSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include three radio addresses delivered by him over radio station WBCM of Bay City, Mich., on the subject of the British loan.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent that tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by the State of California.

PEACE ON EARTH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, India, a country of unrest, peopled by a vast population, is very much in the news these days. I received a letter from my nephew who has served in our armed forces during World War II. He pens these challenging thoughts:

Whenever writing to anyone for the first time from India I'm always troubled by the thought that perhaps they expect from me more than I can offer, the open sesame to India—a mirror that will capture her in reflection and a solution to her problems. I hope you will let me pass with this one simple observation: that the inhabitants of this heathen land are good people like those I found in America, in Mexico, in north Africa, good as I suspect people all over the world are good.

I personally hope the good sense of some British leaders will prevail as per reports, and that India may be granted

a freedom she does not now possess. I think those words, from a 21-year-old youth, could well be taken to heart by all of us during these troubled times.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include an editorial from the Belleville News-Democrat in support of pay increases for postal employees.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING, ETC.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, one of my colleagues the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] presented me with a resolution which he proposes to introduce, apparently sponsored by some 25 or 26 Members of this House. This resolution, if introduced, in my judgment, under the parliamentary procedure will go to the Rules Committee of the House. It seeks to take over, by appointment of a joint Senate and House committee, the complete functions of the Military Affairs Committee of this House on the subject of universal training legislation, selective service law, and the size of the United States Army, and would probably include other matters exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee.

My purpose at this time is to suggest to the chairman of the Rules Committee if and when they reach the point where they may consider holding hearings on it, which I do not think they ever will, the Military Affairs Committee of this House will want to be heard in opposition to it.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs drafted and reported to this House the original selective service law and all amendments thereto, and surely it must be capable of dealing with the problems involved. No longer than last week the committee had General Eisenhower, Chief of Staff, and the Secretary of War and other high-ranking officers of the armed forces to determine the size of the Army of the future and other related questions incidental to the whole broad problem of our future defense establishment. I am sure this body knows what the burdens of your Military Affairs Committee have been and that they constantly are accumulating.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING, ETC.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of what the gentleman from

Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, has just said.

I want to say this to the 26 Members of the House, 13 Republicans and 13 Democrats, who today filed a resolution suggesting a committee from the Senate and House be appointed to study the problem of, first, how many men we are going to need in our postwar Army, and second, what we are going to do about the extension of the selective-service law, which expires May 15, 1946. If this committee will but wait, I am sure the Military Affairs Committee of this House will come here to the floor with ample evidence and information to satisfy every Member of the House. It is our purpose to get all data available and present them factually so that you may know exactly what road Congress may be called upon to follow. I think the Military Affairs Committee of this House can be relied upon to furnish the House with such information.

The Army and Navy Journal of this week gives a rather detailed explanation of what information was brought to our committee only last week by Secretary Byrnes, Secretary Patterson, General Eisenhower, and General Spaatz. If the members of this newly proposed committee will read this article, they will find some information they are looking for. In the meantime, our committee will continue in its efforts to obtain all available information on the vital question of future military policies and practices. We have been, are now, and will be busy in committee to gather facts. Our committee is on the job and I trust the Rules Committee of the House will not see fit to favorably consider the resolution introduced today by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PROGRESSIVE PARTY IN WISCONSIN GOES REPUBLICAN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, coming events cast their shadows before them. Yesterday in Wisconsin the great Progressive Party, realizing the importance of maintaining the two-party structure in the United States, and the part that two-partyism has played in preserving freedom in this country, decided to join one of the two major parties. So we now have the first definite indication of how the people of America are going to vote in the next election. Two hundred and eighty-four voted to join the Republican Party, 51 voted to join the Democratic Party, 67 voted to remain Progressives, and 3 voted to be Socialists.

While the percentage in favor of Republicanism in Wisconsin may be higher than it will be over the remainder of America in the next elections, I am sure the results are just the same. Americans generally, like Progressives in Wisconsin, are turning to the Republican

Party as their one hope for progressive government based on American principles.

I congratulate the Progressives on the good judgment they displayed in Wisconsin, and welcome to our fold Brothers MERLIN HULL of this House and ROBERT LA FOLLETTE of the other body. May their tribe increase.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

THE LATE MISS MABEL BOARDMAN

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the papers today carry the announcement of the death of Miss Mabel Boardman, whose name has been synonymous with the American Red Cross, for these many years.

I shall include as an extension of my remarks the article appearing in the Washington Post of this date which gives a sympathetic and objective history of her service to the Nation.

But it is my desire to pay my respects and give honor to this great woman who has done such honor to Cleveland, the city of her birth.

Long since a national and international power, Miss Boardman never lost contact with this city of the Connecticut Western Reserve. Her warm welcome to those who, like myself, have come to Washington in Government and for other reasons will be a precious memory always. Her vibrant personality, whose charm was like a benediction, has radiated into every dark corner of this anguished world into which the American Red Cross goes, for whatever she touched she infused with the energy and beauty of her own rare spirit.

In the death of Miss Mabel Boardman, the visible contact with a woman of unusual vision, never-failing courage, and consecrated living is broken, but the example of her radiant faith, her tireless service will continue to live and move within the life of our Nation and of the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial by Arnold Spencer of the Audubon (Iowa) Advocate.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on three different subjects and in each to include extraneous matter, including correspondence and a resolution.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein the result of a Gallup poll on the question of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes this afternoon following the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE HUBERT D. STEPHENS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the House the death of the Honorable Hubert D. Stephens, a former Member of this body and a former Senator from the State of Mississippi, who passed away at his home in New Albany, Miss., on last Thursday, March 14.

Mr. Stephens was born in Union County, Miss., on July 2, 1875. He was educated in the common schools and University of Mississippi, and practiced law in New Albany practically all his life, except the time he served in the Congress of the United States. He was married in 1899 to Miss Delia Glenn, of Courtland, Miss., and has two sons, Hubert D., Jr., and Marion Glenn Stephens.

He was elected to the Sixty-second Congress in 1910 and served as a Member of this body for 10 years. In 1922 he was elected to the United States Senate where he served until 1935.

Senator Stephens was a worthy representative of the great State of Mississippi. He was a real American. He believed in the fundamental principles upon which our Nation was founded. His father and my father were country school teachers in neighboring communities during the days of reconstruction, and ever since I was a boy I have been associated with him. I speak with experience when I say that he was one of the finest, most upstanding, patriotic Americans I have ever known. His passage is a personal loss to me as well as to the State and to the Nation.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I knew Hubert Stephens well when he was a Member of the House, also as a Senator and as a private citizen after he retired from public life. He was a man of outstanding ability and of character unimpeachable; he was a great and a good man. We need more Hubert Stephens in the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure and honor to serve with that distinguished American citizen in the House. I recollect his activities and his cooperation under President Wilson while in the House. He has always been with the people, for the people, and one of the grandest representatives of that great State, Mississippi. I regret exceedingly his death.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I express the united sentiment of the entire congressional delegation of the State of Mississippi when I say that we gladly join in the very deserved tributes to the high character and faithful public services of the late and former Senator Hubert D. Stephens, of Mississippi, who served as a Member of the House for 10 years, and subsequently as a Member of the Senate for 12 years.

I now yield to my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, we were all very much saddened to hear of the death of a distinguished former colleague of this Congress, Hubert Stephens. I knew him quite well and had the privilege of serving here at the same time he was serving in the other body. He was truly a great Mississippian and a great American. He was a man of outstanding character and it can be truthfully said of Hubert Stephens that he never did a little thing in his life. He was always a great man and a big man.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House and everyone else who knew Senator Stephens joins me in extending our profound and heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved family.

A great American has passed away. Peace to his ashes, and honor to his memory.

EXPENSES FOR CONDUCTING INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 563) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from March 1, 1946, the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$35,000 including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such study and investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the House on March 7 passed a resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate all

phases of transportation. Following the passage of that resolution the majority and minority members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee came before the Committee on Accounts and asked for \$50,000 to make the investigation. As the resolution provided that this committee could ask for assistance from Government agencies the Committee on Accounts recommended \$35,000 to complete the investigation. I feel that the committee could get along with less as they must make their report during the present Congress, but, as I said at the outset, I was directed to report the resolution which carries \$35,000.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES FOR EMPLOYEES OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit another privileged resolution (H. Res. 564) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That in lieu of the provisions of the Legislative Appropriation Act for 1946 providing salaries for employees of the Civil Service Committee, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, effective March 1, 1946, compensation at the rate of \$3,300 per annum for the employment of a clerk (which shall be considered the prevailing rate in accordance with the terms of Public Law 512, approved December 20, 1944, as amended), \$2,460 for the employment of an assistant clerk, and \$1,560 for the employment of a janitor to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Civil Service is one of the committees of the House that is not properly staffed. With the resignation of former Chairman Ramspeck, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] was named chairman of the committee to succeed him. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] was formerly chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia and had three outstanding clerks which he took with him to the Committee on the Civil Service. He has asked that his committee be advanced to the class where the salaries are \$3,300 for clerk, \$2,460 for assistant clerk, and \$1,560 for messenger.

This committee was directed by resolution of the House to make certain investigations which were carried on for a number of years under that resolution. There is to the credit of the committee, \$15,000. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] informed the Committee on Accounts that it was not his purpose to make any additional investigations unless something unforeseen was presented. In view of that, the Committee on Accounts recommends this legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 30 OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 301) to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress,

and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 301) to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 2, and agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
SHERIDAN DOWNNEY,
ABE MURDOCK,
ROBERT A. TAFT,

Managers of the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 301) to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The effect of clause (a) of the joint resolution as it passed the House was to permit the funds authorized for the 1945 crop program operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used with respect to any of the 1946 crop program operations of such Corporation. The Senate amendment limits the provision relating to 1946 crop program operations so that such provision will apply only with respect to operations relating to sugar, vegetables processed prior to July 1, 1946, and flaxseed harvested prior to July 1, 1946. Under this amendment no payments or purchases with respect to vegetables or flaxseed can be made after June 30, 1946, unless such vegetables are processed or such flaxseed harvested prior to July 1, 1946. The House recedes on this amendment.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment increases the amount of Reconstruction Finance Corporation funds which may be used for continuing the meat-subsidy program and the flour-subsidy program through June 30, 1946. Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 23, 1945 (59 Stat. 260), imposed certain limitations with respect to the amount of funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that might be used for subsidy payments and anticipated losses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946. The over-all limitation imposed was \$1,500,000,000, of which \$595,000,000 was allocated for meat and \$190,000,000 for flour; \$36,000,000 of the original limitation for meat was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to Public Law 164, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 31, 1945, thus reducing the amount available to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation

for meat-subsidy payments to \$559,000,000. Under this Senate amendment to this joint resolution, the allocation for meat will be increased by \$125,000,000 and the allocation for flour will be increased by \$25,000,000.

The additional allocation of \$125,000,000 for meat will be required to continue the present meat-subsidy program through June 30, 1946. These payments have been running at the rate of approximately \$60,000,000 per month. Moreover, while the Office of Price Administration, with the approval of the Director of Economic Stabilization, has increased the ceiling price for meat, effective March 11, 1946, to cover the increase in wages recently authorized in the meat-packing industry, a temporary increase in the meat-subsidy payments will be made to "bridge the gap" between the effective date of the wage increase (which in some cases will be retroactive to January 26) and March 11, 1946, a period of less than 60 days. The increase of \$25,000,000 recommended in the original allocation of \$190,000,000 for subsidy payments on flour will be required to continue the flour-subsidy program through June 30, 1946. These payments have been running at the rate of about \$18,000,000 per month.

Because of the discontinuance or curtailment of certain subsidy programs authorized by the act of June 23, 1945, the increased amounts approved for meat and flour will not result in any increase in the over-all limitation of \$1,500,000,000 provided by that act for subsidy payments and anticipated losses by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

The House recedes.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why is it that you are increasing the subsidies to be paid for wheat farming and sugar farming? Is it not about time that you paid the farmer the price that he ought to get for the wheat, sugar, and stop these subsidies and not let your children and your children's children in years to come pay the bill that you ought to be paying today? It is a crime to the oncoming generations to permit such a thing as that. It does not even show sound business on the part of the Democratic Party. Certainly we can pay our own way, and pay it now. If you cannot, then it is your duty to economize in Government spending. Oh, what this administration has done to our country in spending, spending, spending, electing, electing, electing. Yes; a \$279,000,000,000 deficit is the result—a monument to the Democrats and the New Deal. A headache to the taxpayers and future generations.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman has asked more than a question. This is the bill which passed the House and provided for the purchase of the Hawaiian and Cuban sugar crops, and provided that it might be sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation at a loss. That was done in order to obtain the sugar that was necessary, and which would not otherwise have been obtained. When it went to the Senate the Senate amended it to include an increase in the subsidies on flour of \$25,000,000 and on meat of \$125,000,000.

It is in the nature of a deficiency appropriation. It does not change the policy in any way. It merely provides for carrying out the policy that was formulated by the Congress, and it is within the limitations of the money authorized for that purpose, \$1,500,000,000. It is merely to carry out the existing program.

If this includes these other allocations, the whole amount of money now expended will be well within the \$1,500,000,000. If this is not done, there will be an abrupt stoppage of the appropriations for meat and flour at this time. The appropriation for meat amounts to \$60,000,000 a month. This is merely to carry over this program until June 30 of this year. It will not commit anybody as to any future subsidies. This was a unanimous report by the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate. I certainly hope the House will agree to the conference report.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Notwithstanding the fact that this was a policy adopted a few years ago, the policy is all cockeyed. The policy you have adopted of trying to subsidize the people of this Nation, where you can have the bureaucrats controlling them in every way possible, is about as cockeyed a proposition as was ever made to the American people. That is the kind of proposition Hitler made to the people in Germany. That is the kind of thing they are doing over in Russia. It is about time we stopped it in this country. If we are going to have a free America, we want to get the people of this country paid for what they are doing instead of subsidizing them for our children to pay the bill. It seems to me this is about the poorest policy this administration has ever adopted. If Mr. Hannegan is going to give you fellows a dinner so that he can ask you to continue this policy, it is about time you quit. Quit following the New Deal. It is time to be American in every sense of the word.

Mr. SPENCE. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman said he was going to ask a question. I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman tell us whether or not, in his opinion, this amount of subsidy will give us the amount of sugar that will be needed for the coming season?

Mr. SPENCE. I cannot tell that. It means the purchase of the entire crop of Cuba and Hawaii, as I understand. Otherwise we probably would not obtain it at all. I certainly hope the House will agree to the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AGENCY

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 565, Rept. No. 1751),

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4873) to create an Agricultural Credit Agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair expects to recognize a Member later to move to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

RECORDING OF AGREEMENTS RELATING TO PATENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3756) to require the recording of agreements relating to patents.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CORRECTING NAVAL RECORD OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CREWS OF REVENUE CUTTERS ALGONQUIN AND ONONDAGA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1498) to correct the naval record of former members of the crews of the revenue cutters *Algonquin* and *Onondaga*.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF FISH HATCHERY TO THE CITY OF LAWTON, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1389) providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that I received his letter with reference to the transfer of this property. The thought I have in mind is this. I can remember a few years ago when the gentleman was talking about establishing these fish hatcheries. At that time he was very energetic in trying to see to it that the Government took over this property and handled it. This, then I opposed. It was not successful; a poor adventure for the Department of Fisheries. Now they want to give it up. They want to give it to one of the cities of your own State. It seemed to me that it was a poor business proposition at the time. We tried at that time to prevent the Government from taking the property over. Now, it proves that it is a poor proposition so far as the Government is concerned. Yet the Government is going to give to the city property that is valued at \$33,400. I do not think we ought to give our property away like that because the taxpayers in my State are being worked with their noses to the grindstone trying to pay the taxes that this administration has placed upon them. Now you not only want to tax them for everything but you want to give everything away. It does not make sense to me.

Mr. BLAND. Would you not rather do that than to spend any more money on it?

Mr. RICH. Well, yes; but let us sell it to somebody. If it is worth anything, let us sell it to someone in Oklahoma and let them pay for it, even if it is only \$100 or \$500. Let us get something for it. You have had the habit of giving Government property and money away for no good reason. Time to stop it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. RICH. I withhold it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I say to the gentleman that this hatchery was successfully operated by an individual for a number of years. It is true that I cooperated in helping the Fish and Wildlife Service secure this fish hatchery because I believed it could be had at a bargain and I felt it a practical and economical way of solving the hatchery problem then in the area than to build a new hatchery. I regret to say that Bureau never made a success of this hatchery. It would serve no purpose to give all of the reasons for its failure. But the fact remains that the Fish and Wildlife Service never has hatched half as many fish as had been regularly hatched each season by a private individual. Perhaps the Fish and Wildlife Service was unfortunate in the man who was placed in charge of this hatchery. I do not know him. Maybe he was short of help. Anyway, the main excuse given was that they did not have sufficient help. Now they say they have more hatcheries than they have help to maintain those hatcheries. The city of Lawton is willing to take over this hatchery and furnish the help without any expense to the Government to maintain it.

Furthermore we are assured that the city of Lawton can and will do a much better job than has the Federal Government. Here is a chance to get a hatchery off the pay roll of the Federal Government and let the city maintain it. The Fish and Wildlife Service states, as I recall, that it will require \$45,000 to adequately build and equip this hatchery like they want it if they are to keep and maintain it. Our committee is not willing to put up \$45,000. Then it will be a rather expensive hatchery to maintain if the committee and the Congress permits them to operate it as they desire it to be operated.

Mr. RICH. If that is the case, I congratulate the gentleman on not spending \$45,000 more for a dead horse. But I think you ought to try to sell that to somebody out in Oklahoma. Why should we give it away? There is no reason for giving it away. If the property is worth anything at all, let us find somebody in Oklahoma who is willing to pay something for it. If they are going to build a private hatchery, there certainly ought to be people out there who will give something for that property. Let us try to relieve the Treasury of some of the debt that we have of \$279,000,000,000. We cannot stand such a debt. Let us help pay it off.

The SPEAKER. The Chair demands the regular order. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TOLL BRIDGE AT OLD SAYBROOK, CONN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4940) granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Old Saybrook, Conn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent is hereby granted to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Connecticut River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Old Saybrook, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the cost of the bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 31 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditure for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 2, line 19, insert:

"SEC. 3. No toll or other charge shall be levied against any employee, civil or military, or any vehicle, or conveyance, of the United States Government for the use of such bridge in the performance of official duties."

Renumber section 3 to read "SEC. 4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE AT CLINTON, IOWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4914) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT OR NEAR DECATUR, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1425) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.," approved June 8, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when this bill was called up the last time the calendar was called, I raised the point that the bill did not provide exemption for Government vehicles in the use of the toll bridge. It is my understanding that it has been the general practice, at least in the past, that these toll bridge bills do contain such a provision so that public vehicles do not have to pay a toll when the bridge is used in the performance of public duties.

Unless such amendment is offered to this bill, I will oppose its consideration at this time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I propose to offer such an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved June 8, 1940, authorizing the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Missouri River, at or near Decatur, Nebr., is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to is commenced within 1 year and completed within 3 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 2, after line 2, insert a new section:

"SEC. 2. No toll or other charge shall be levied against any employee, civil or military, or any vehicle or conveyance of the United States Government for the use of such bridge in the performance of official duties."

And renumber section 2 to read "SEC. 3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RAINY RIVER NEAR BAUDETTE, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5544) authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to facilitate international commerce, improve the postal service, and provide for military and other purposes the village of Baudette, Minn., its public successors and public assigns, be, and it is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and approaches thereto across the Rainy River, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of said river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Baudette, Minn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act, and subject to the approval of the proper authorities in Canada.

SEC. 2. There is hereby conferred upon the village of Baudette, Minn., its public successors and public assigns, all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Minnesota, needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are now possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of Minnesota upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such State.

SEC. 3. The said village of Baudette, Minn., its public successors and public assigns, are authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge in accordance with any laws

of Canada applicable thereto, and the rates of toll so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of War under authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 4. In fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of such bridge the same shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintenance, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under efficient and economical management, and to provide funds sufficient to amortize the cost of such bridge and its approaches, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 20 years from the completion thereof. After funds sufficient for such amortization of said bridge and its approaches shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls. An accurate record of the cost of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditure for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage to any public agency or to an international bridge authority is hereby granted to the village of Baudette, Minn., its public successors and public assigns; and any such agency or authority to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such agency or authority.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 4, after line 5, insert a new section:

"SEC. 6. No toll or other charge shall be levied against any employee, civil or military, or any vehicle or conveyance of the United States Government for the use of such bridge in the performance of official duties."

Renumber section 6 to read "SEC. 7."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOPEWELL VILLAGE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3533) to authorize revisions in the boundary of the Hopewell Village National Historic Site, Pa., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4731) to authorize the Alaska Railroad to engage in the business of operating ocean-going vessels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3565) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SISSETON INDIAN RESERVATION, S. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2947) to authorize the consolidation of lands on the Sisseton Indian Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized in his discretion, to acquire by gift, purchase, relinquishment, or exchange any lands, surface rights, water rights, or any interest in lands, including any improvements thereon, located within the exterior boundaries of the Sisseton Indian Reservation, S. Dak. Title to all property rights thus acquired shall be taken in the name of the United States of America in trust for the Indians of the Sisseton Reservation and shall be nontaxable as long as the title remains in the United States. For carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use any funds appropriated pursuant to the authority contained in section 5 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984).

SEC. 2. The lands acquired under authority contained in section 1 of this act shall be made available for the use and occupancy of Indians of the Sisseton Reservation through assignment, lease, agreement, or permit, pursuant to regulations approved by the Secretary of the Interior, but no part of such lands shall be allotted in severalty, except through specific authorization by Congress.

SEC. 3. With the consent of the Indians of the Sisseton Reservation, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to sell any tribal lands on the reservation situated outside of areas selected for consolidation for Indian use, title to be conveyed by patent in fee, and to use the proceeds derived from such sales in acquiring other lands which shall be subject to the terms and conditions prescribed by section 1 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "Reservation", strike out the comma and the word "South Dakota."

Page 2, line 22, after the figure "1", insert "and section 2."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the consolidation of

lands on the Sisseton Indian Reservation, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMESTEAD ENTRY CREDIT FOR MILITARY OR NAVAL SERVICE IN WORLD WAR II

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5271) to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved September 27, 1944, entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II" (Public, No. 434, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end thereof, by substituting a colon, and by inserting the following proviso: "Provided, That no person who has served or may serve in the military or naval forces of the United States for a period of at least 90 days during World War II and is honorably discharged shall be disqualified from making homestead entry or from any other benefits of this act merely by reason of not having reached the age of 21 years."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASIC AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES OF BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5654) to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] explain the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes at the request of the Department of the Interior and, in a way, at the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. About a year ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] pointed out that certain items of appropriation bills were objected to and often thrown out on a point of order because of doubtful authorization. Previously there were many things the Bureau of Reclamation needed to do in the routine of its work; to illustrate, the making of purchases of rubber boots, the buying of ice for construction workers, and many such small items of needed purchases. We cannot afford not to have such items carried in general in the appropriation bill and this bill is basic authority to permit their inclusion under authority of law so that points of order cannot lie against them and thus permit the Department to continue doing what it ordinarily does in order that its needs may be met.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The bill was reported out unanimously by the committee, was it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is a unanimous report from the committee; that is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I note that in subparagraph (h) on page 3 authorization is given for "other necessary expenses in the preparation of raw public lands for irrigation farming on the Boulder Canyon project and Gila project, Arizona."

It occurs to me that the form in which the bill is written would limit that authority to these two irrigation projects, whereas others will be arising from time to time.

Mr. MURDOCK. The language is so drawn in the bill that it relates specifically to these two projects, as they are in condition for that work to be done now, and the work needs to be done.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It occurs to me the same situation would exist with other projects, and I wonder if the gentleman would object to an amendment inserting the words "and other irrigation projects duly authorized by Federal law"?

Mr. MURDOCK. While I personally have no objection to the amendment, the bill was unanimously reported by the committee, and I hope there will be no objection to its passage.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection with the statement that I shall offer such an amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to other purposes for which appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation are authorized by law, appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation are hereby authorized for—

(a) disseminating facts, including recordings, solely in connection with the administration of the reclamation laws: *Provided,* That, to the end of avoiding wasteful duplication, this provision shall not be construed as authorizing the dissemination of information which other Federal agencies are specifically authorized to distribute and are regularly engaged in distributing.

(b) refunds of overcollections and deposits for other purposes under the reclamation laws;

(c) payment of damages caused to the owners of lands or other private property of any kind by reason of the operations of the United States, its officers, or employees, in the survey, construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation works;

(d) payment of rewards, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of persons found guilty of the theft, damage, or destruction of public property;

(e) payment to the school district or districts serving the areas in and about Mason City and Coulee Dam, Wash.; Boulder City, Nev.; Davis Dam, Ariz. and Nev.; and Seminole Dam, Wyo., and to school districts serving similar areas in and about other Federal reclamation projects, and projects operated in part by the Bureau of Reclamation as reimbursement for the cost of instruction, in elementary and secondary schools, of dependents of employees of the United States living on federally owned property in or in the immediate vicinity of such projects, and of their transportation to and from school:

Provided, That only the costs so incurred with respect to dependents of employees of the United States performing services deemed essential to the construction, operation, or maintenance of any such projects shall be reimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

(f) payment on behalf of the Northport irrigation district to the Farmers' irrigation district for carriage of water;

(g) official telephone service in the field in the case of official telephones installed in private houses when authorized under regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior;

(h) land leveling, construction of farm ditches on units of public lands, production of soil-building crops, and other necessary expenses in the preparation of raw public lands for irrigation farming on the Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal) and Gila project, Arizona;

(i) operation and maintenance of camps and other facilities turned over by construction contractors and similar facilities and the furnishing of services related thereto on the Columbia Basin project, Washington.

SEC. 2. Revenues received from the lease of marginal lands, Tule Lake division (Klamath project, Oregon-California), shall be available for refunds to the lessees in such cases where it becomes necessary to make refunds because of flooding, or other reasons within the terms of such leases.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 3, line 20, after the word "Arizona," insert "and other irrigation projects duly authorized by Federal law."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad there was no objection to this bill, H. R. 5654. It is wholly noncontroversial and it should be enacted promptly. Let me explain the need for it as shown in committee hearings.

You will recall that last March, during the course of consideration of the Department of Agriculture's appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1946, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, called attention to the fact that points of order were being raised against items in appropriation bills and that these points of order were based, in the main, on the proposition that the items against which they were directed were not specifically authorized by law. The gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, said in part:

I should like to give notice to the departments, to the legislative committees of the House and to all concerned that in the next session nothing will be included in any appropriation bill, however customary or however urgent, that is not specifically authorized by law. I trust this notice is in ample time to permit any department to make application to legislative committees having jurisdiction, and in time for such committees to report such authorization, if they so desire.

Section 10 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, Thirty-second Statutes, page 388, provides—

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect.

Substantially similar provisions are contained in the act of August 13, 1914, and in the act of August 4, 1939. Now, I was not a member of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation when the 1902 or 1914 acts were passed, nor was I a Member of the Congress. However, I was a member of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation when the act of August 4, 1939, was passed. I remember very well the provision authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to perform any and all acts necessary and proper in carrying out the provisions of the act. Gentlemen, we meant that provision to mean exactly what it says. Notwithstanding these broad provisions, rulings of the Comptroller General have tended to cast doubt upon the authority of the Secretary to make recordings, to purchase ice, to purchase rubber boots; upon the authority to offer and to pay rewards for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of persons found guilty of the theft, damage, or destruction of public property; upon the availability of revenues received from the lease of marginal land for refunds under appropriate contract; and upon the availability of appropriations for payment to school districts as reimbursement for the cost of instruction of dependents of employees of the United States.

There are other items which have appeared in the annual acts making appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior. Some of these items have been inserted in the appropriation acts as insurance against an adverse ruling by the Comptroller General, other items have been added at the request of the Bureau of the Budget, and some items have been added at the instance of Members of the Congress.

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has conducted extensive hearings on these matters. It has given much time and study to the bill H. R. 5654 and it has, by unanimous action, reported favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass. This bill specifically authorizes appropriations for a series of purposes therein enumerated. These purposes include: Disseminating facts, including recordings, in connection with the administration of the reclamation laws; refunds of overcollections and deposits for other purposes under the reclamation laws; payment of damages caused to the owners of lands or other private property of any kind by reason of the operations of the United States, its officers or employees, in the survey, construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation works; payment of rewards when specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of persons found guilty of theft, damage, or destruction of public property; payment on behalf of the Northport irrigation district to the Farmers' irrigation district for carriage of water; official telephone service in the field in the case of official telephones installed in private

houses, when authorized under regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior; land leveling, construction of farm ditches on units of public lands, including the production of soil building crops and other necessary expenses in the preparation of raw public lands for irrigation on the Boulder Canyon project—All-American Canal—and the Gila project, Arizona; operation and maintenance of camps and other facilities turned over by construction contractors and similar facilities, and the furnishing of services related thereto on the Columbia Basin project, Washington.

Section 2 of H. R. 5654 would make available for refunds to lessees revenues received from the lease of marginal lands in the Tule Lake division of the Klamath project, Oregon-California.

Finally, H. R. 5654 would authorize payments to the school district or districts serving the areas in and about Mason City and Coulee Dam, Wash.; Boulder City, Nev.; Davis Dam, Ariz. and Nev.; Seminole Dam, Wyo.; and to school districts serving similar areas in and about other Federal reclamation projects and projects operated in part by the Bureau of Reclamation, as reimbursement for the cost of instruction in elementary and secondary schools of dependents of employees of the United States, living on federally owned property in or in the immediate vicinity of such projects and of their transportation to and from school. However, only costs so incurred with respect to dependents of employees performing services deemed essential to the construction, operation, or maintenance of Federal reclamation projects, would be reimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

This bill will comply with the wishes of our colleague, Chairman CANNON of the Committee on Appropriations. It has been prepared in response to his warning that "nothing will be included in any appropriation bill, however customary or however urgent, that is not specifically authorized by law." Its enactment will specifically authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to do what the Congress has, as a general proposition, authorized it to do each year in the annual appropriation acts for the Department of the Interior.

I would now like to give a short statement on each item as it appears in H. R. 5654:

(a) Disseminating facts, including recordings, solely in connection with the administration of reclamation laws: *Provided*, That, to the end of avoiding wasteful duplication, this provision shall not be construed as authorizing the dissemination of information which other Federal agencies are specifically authorized to distribute and are regularly engaged in distributing.

Language similar to the above, in regard to recordings, except for the proviso, was inserted in the Interior Department's Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1942, because the Comptroller General had ruled that the Bureau of Reclamation was not authorized to expend funds for the purpose of making recordings. The use of recordings is particularly helpful in protecting prospective settlers against being victimized by land speculators.

(b) Refunds of overcollections and deposits for other purposes under the reclamation laws.

Similar language has appeared in the appropriation act since 1920. This is another example of an authorization inserted in an appropriation act to overcome the objections of the Comptroller of the Treasury, who, about 1919, had ruled that the Bureau of Reclamation could not refund money to farmers who had paid water-right charges on land that had been cut out by a flood of the river.

(c) Payment of damages caused to the owners of lands or other private property of any kind by reason of the operations of the United States, its officers, or employees, in the survey, construction, operation, or maintenance of irrigation works.

For the past 30 years similar language has appeared in the appropriation acts making appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. This provision, too, became advisable because the Comptroller General had cast doubt upon the authority of the Secretary to make such settlements. This provision does not authorize the payment of claims based on the negligence of employees of the Government but authorizes the payment of damages to claimants whose claims are based on acts of omission or commission on the part of employees of the United States.

(d) Payment of rewards, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, for information leading to the apprehension and conviction of persons found guilty of the theft, damage, or destruction of public property.

The House hearings on the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1931, at page 774, contain the following explanation:

Language is proposed to authorize the payment of rewards. This has heretofore been done under the operations of the reclamation fund. However, the Comptroller General holds in decision of May 20, 1929, A-26810, that there being grave doubt as to the propriety of regarding an appropriation in general terms available for the payment of such rewards and the Congress having on many occasions accepted the matter as one for its consideration and expression, it appears the duty of this officer to require those in administrative places who desire to offer rewards for information or other assistance to aid in the accomplishment of authorized work to submit their requirements to the Congress for specific legislative authority with respect to all appropriations hereafter to be made.

(e) payment to the school district or districts serving the areas in and about Mason City and Coulee Dam, Wash.; Boulder City, Nev.; Davis Dam, Ariz. and Nev.; and Seminole Dam, Wyo., and to school districts serving similar areas in and about other Federal reclamation projects, and projects operated in part by the Bureau of Reclamation as reimbursement for the cost of instruction, in elementary and secondary schools, of dependents of employees of the United States living on Federally owned property in or in the immediate vicinity of such projects, and of their transportation to and from school: *Provided*, That only the costs so incurred with respect to dependents of employees of the United States performing services deemed essential to the construction, operation, or maintenance of any such projects shall be reimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws.

This provision is an enlargement on the authorization in regard to the payment to school districts, heretofore included in the appropriation acts relating to the Bureau of Reclamation. Authorization to make payment to school districts in addition to those at Mason City, Coulee Dam and Boulder City has been included. The Committees on Appropriations should be enabled to afford similar relief to other school districts in the same or similar circumstances.

(f) payment on behalf of the Northport irrigation district to the Farmers' Irrigation district for carriage of water.

This language has appeared in the appropriation act for a number of years. It merely authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to apply part of the net power revenues due the Northport irrigation district to its indebtedness to the Farmers' irrigation district.

(g) official telephone service in the field in the case of official telephones installed in private houses when authorized under regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior.

Specific authorization for the payment of official telephone service in the field, in the case of special telephones installed in the private residence of employees of the Bureau, has been included in the annual appropriation acts of the Department of the Interior for the Bureau of Reclamation because section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912 (37 Stat. 360) requires such special authorization. For over 25 years the Congress has recognized that the Bureau of Reclamation should be authorized to make these installations in proper cases. For instance, it is necessary to install a telephone in the house of a ditch rider so that he may be called in the middle of the night in case of a break in the canal. Such rapid communication has undoubtedly saved the United States many times its cost.

(h) Land leveling, construction of farm ditches on units of public lands, production of soil-building crops, and other necessary expenses in the preparation of raw public lands for irrigation farming on the Boulder Canyon project (All-American Canal) and Gila project, Arizona.

Such predevelopment is necessary on these projects for the purpose of conditioning the soil and determining what crops can be grown most economically when desert land of this type is brought under irrigation. Predevelopment will expedite successful settlement of public land, enabling settlers to produce crops much earlier, and insure quicker return of the Government's investment in irrigation facilities. Alfalfa, the major crop produced on land of this type, generally commands a price, which would in a few years return the cost of predevelopment.

The Congress first authorized work of this kind on the All-American Canal project in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1942.

(i) Operation and maintenance of camps and other facilities turned over by construction contractors and similar facilities and the furnishing of services related thereto on the Columbia Basin project, Washington.

The contractors under their contract with the United States were required to

turn over to the United States all buildings and facilities. These buildings are now used by the Bureau of Reclamation for housing employees engaged in the operation and maintenance of the project.

The Congress first authorized the Bureau to maintain and operate these camps by inserting similar language in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1943. It has been included in all annual subsequent appropriation acts for the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation.

SEC. 2. Revenues received from the lease of marginal lands, Tule Lake division (Klamath project, Oregon-California) shall be available for refunds to the lessees in such cases where it becomes necessary to make refunds because of flooding or other reasons within the terms of such leases.

Authority similar to the language in section 2 of H. R. 5654 has appeared in the annual appropriation acts since 1929.

It merely authorizes the Bureau to refund the money paid by farmers to the United States for leases of land if such land is flooded and cannot be used for farming.

The Comptroller General has ruled that money may not be refunded after it is deposited in the Treasury unless it is specifically authorized.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF CERTAIN CURRENCIES DESTROYED IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 321, to authorize the making of settlement on account of certain currency destroyed at Fort Mills, P. I., and for other purposes.

There being no objection the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas during the emergency in the Philippine Islands at the time of the Japanese invasion, agents of the United States High Commissioner, acting under a delegation of authority from the President of the United States and the specific instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury, accepted sums of United States paper currency from banks, individuals, and the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands, and destroyed this currency by incineration to preclude its seizure by the enemy; and

Whereas the face value of the currency so destroyed was reported to be \$2,563,981 and due to the difficult circumstances under which the program was undertaken, including lack of facilities, exposure to incessant enemy attack, and lack of personnel familiar with the technical details imposed by law with respect to the separate accounting for various kinds of currency, it was not possible to record in full detail the description of the currency which was burned; and

Whereas the United States Treasury is assured that the aggregate amount of currency destroyed is correct as reported by the High Commissioner and his staff with respect to the procedures followed in accepting deposits and in certifying the count in each such deposit and that the distribution by denomination and depositor is accurate; and

Whereas \$603,158 of the total currency destroyed cannot be identified from the information available to the Treasury Department as to kind of currency and, in the case of Federal Reserve notes, as to bank of issue; and

Whereas the currency has been destroyed and it appears that no further information will become available; Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding any provisions of law to the contrary, the Treasurer of the United States or the Comptroller of the Currency, as the case may be, is authorized and directed, on the basis of the receipt of evidence of destruction acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury, to record the destruction of the United States currency and Federal Reserve notes delivered to the High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands at the time of the Japanese invasion to preclude its seizure by the enemy, in the aggregate amount of \$603,158, as follows: Silver certificates, \$202,502 of \$1 denomination, \$51,200 of \$5 denomination, and \$300 of \$10 denomination, aggregating \$254,002; United States notes, \$8,796 of \$2 denomination and \$25,590 of \$5 denomination, aggregating \$34,386; and Federal Reserve notes, \$1,170 of \$5 denomination, \$126,360 of \$10 denomination, \$185,840 of \$20 denomination, \$400 of \$50 denomination, and \$1,000 of \$100 denomination, aggregating \$314,770, which shall be apportioned as to denominations among the several Federal Reserve banks as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury within the limitations as provided in section 2 hereof, as to the aggregate amount to be apportioned to each Federal Reserve bank.

SEC. 2. The Treasurer of the United States is authorized to pay to the Secretary of the Treasury for account of the owners of the United States currency referred to in this joint resolution as silver certificates and United States notes the value thereof from the appropriate Treasury funds and to pay to the Secretary of the Treasury for account of the owners of the currency described as Federal Reserve notes the amount thereof from the Federal Reserve note redemption fund. The several Federal Reserve banks shall respectively reimburse the Federal Reserve redemption fund for the amounts paid by the Treasurer of the United States from said fund pursuant to this section, in the following amounts: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, \$205; Federal Reserve Bank of New York, \$4,555; Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, \$150; Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, \$195; Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, \$480; Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, \$250; Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, \$290; Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, \$55; Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, \$120; Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, \$270; Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, \$300; and Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, \$307,900.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING SAFETY AT SEA AND AIDING NAVIGATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3139) to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be in the public interest that the technical and scientific advances in fields of science, and improvements in materials, equipment, facilities, and techniques which have been developed or utilized in the prosecution of the war or otherwise should at the earliest time practicable and to the fullest extent feasible be adapted to and employed in the administration of a comprehensive program of promoting safety of life and property and aiding navigation on and over the high seas and on navigable waters of the United States.

SEC. 2. In furtherance of the program referred to in the preceding section the Coast Guard is authorized and directed (a) to investigate, study, and keep abreast of the advances and improvements referred to in such section, including those developed or employed by the civilian and military agencies of this Government and foreign countries and private organizations in this country and abroad; and (b) within the limits of available appropriations, to undertake designs, developments, and tests appropriate to adapt such advances and improvements and to put them into use to the extent feasible and as soon as practicable, in its activities in the fields of air-sea rescue operations and promoting safety of life and property and aiding navigation on and over the high seas and on navigable waters of the United States.

SEC. 3. All agencies of the Federal Government are hereby directed to cooperate with the Coast Guard in carrying out the purpose of this act: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as requiring any agency of the Federal Government to release to the Coast Guard information concerning any development, improvement, equipment, or facility classified for reasons of security: *Provided further*, That any such agency may release such information to the Coast Guard on condition that the restrictions governing the classification be observed as long as the security classification is considered necessary by such Federal agency.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "directed", insert the words "within the limits of available appropriations."

On page 2, line 10, strike out "within the limits of available appropriations."

Page 3, after line 4, add a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. V. This act shall not be construed to vest in the Coast Guard any authority, in addition to that provided by law prior to the approval of this act, to require apparatus, equipment, or facilities to be installed, carried, or used on vessels subject to inspection or regulation under the navigation and vessel inspection laws.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUSTER BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1185) to change the designation of Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, in the State of Montana, to "Custer Battlefield National Monument," and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the area now within the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, in the State of Montana, shall hereafter be known as the "Custer Battlefield National Monument," under which name this national monument shall be entitled to receive and to use all moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1162) to convey certain lands to the State of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed, upon the payment by the State of \$12 to convey to the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest of the United States to a portion of the National Elk Refuge, Wyoming, a parcel of land in the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 27, township 41 north, range 116 west, of the sixth principal meridian, Wyoming, the said parcel being described by metes and bounds as follows: From the southwest corner of the aforesaid section 27 run north no degrees two minutes west one thousand seven hundred and two feet and then north eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes east forty feet to the place of beginning at the southwest corner of the parcel hereby conveyed; thence from said place of beginning north no degrees two minutes west one hundred feet; then north eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes east two hundred and nine feet; thence south no degrees two minutes east one hundred feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west two hundred and nine feet to the place of beginning, containing forty-eight one hundredths of an acre, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 304) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all governmental buildings on October 11, 1946, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT ESTABLISHING THE HOT SPRINGS NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5317) to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of April 20, 1904 (33 Stat. 187), as amended (16 U. S. C. 372), is further amended by striking out the words "Eastern United States Judicial District of Arkansas" and inserting in lieu thereof "Western United States Judicial District of Arkansas."

Sec. 2. Section 6 of the act of April 20, 1904 (33 Stat. 188), as amended (16 U. S. C. 376), is further amended by striking out the words "United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas" wherever they appear in said section and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas."

Sec. 3. Section 7 of the act of April 20, 1904 (33 Stat. 188), as amended (16 U. S. C. 377), is further amended by striking out the words

"United States District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas."

Sec. 4. Section 8 of the act of April 20, 1904 (33 Stat. 189), as amended (16 U. S. C. 378), is further amended by striking out the words "Eastern District of Arkansas" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Western District of Arkansas."

Sec. 5. Section 9 of the act of April 20, 1904 (33 Stat. 189), as amended (16 U. S. C. 379), is further amended by striking out the words "Eastern District of Arkansas" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Western District of Arkansas."

Sec. 6. Section 12 of the act of April 20, 1904 (33 Stat. 189, 16 U. S. C. 382), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. All persons who may be imprisoned for nonpayment of any fine or costs provided for by this act or awaiting trial without bail, shall be confined in any approved jail situated in the western district of Arkansas or at such place as may be otherwise designated."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF FISH HATCHERY TO THE CITY OF LAWTON, OKLA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 347 and the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1389) providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Lawton, Okla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the fish-hatchery property which is located south of such city in Comanche County, Okla., and which is now under the control of the Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a newspaper article.

OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FOR CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS AND DISTRICT COURTS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4230) to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts:

Be it enacted, etc., That every circuit judge and every district judge may employ a law clerk and a secretary and such other assistants and employees as may be necessary and as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year, except that for the appointment of a law clerk by a district judge a certificate to the necessity of the appointment by the senior circuit judge of the circuit, having jurisdiction over the district in which the

clerk is needed, shall be requisite. Also every circuit court of appeals and every district court may appoint such librarians and other officers and employees not otherwise provided for as may be necessary and may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

Sec. 2. The officers and employees provided for in this act shall, subject to appropriations to be made by the Congress, receive compensation to be fixed from time to time by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and shall be reimbursed for their actual traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence, within the limitations prescribed by law, when necessarily absent from their designated posts of duty on official business.

Sec. 3. Within the meaning of this act the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be both a circuit and a district, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia a circuit court of appeals, and the chief justice and associate justices of that court the senior circuit judge and circuit judges thereof, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia a district court, and the chief justice and associate justices of that court the senior district judge and district judges thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] If not, the question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

GRANTING FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR CERTAIN POWERS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 553 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5407) to grant to the Federal Works Administrator certain powers with respect to site acquisition, building construction, purchase of buildings, and other matters. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 553 provides for the consideration of H. R. 5407, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill has a number of provisions, Mr. Speaker, which will, of course, be explained in detail by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who has done his usual outstanding work on this bill.

Briefly, the bill permits the Public Buildings Administration to use \$13,-

000,000 of unobligated balances for various projects, including needed extensions to marine hospitals in Seattle, Wash., and San Francisco, Calif., and \$2,000,000 for purchase of land here in the District of Columbia. Authorization to permit a higher limit on the District of Columbia central heating plant is in section 2, and section 3 enables the city of New York to proceed with the tunnel from Manhattan to Brooklyn.

One of the most important provisions, in my judgment, is section 5, authorizing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to maintain a survey of Government-owned and leased office space with the purpose of making more economical use of available space. I am satisfied that if this investigation is thorough and efficient, both space and money can be saved. In conjunction with section 4, which makes it possible for more than one agency to be housed in the same building, this should result in greater economy and efficiency.

Other sections of the bill provide permanent legislative authority for some services by the Public Buildings Administration that have been authorized in appropriation bills heretofore, such as furnishing ordinary communications service to several executive agencies; one clarifies the authority of the Administration over food services and another authorizes transfer of an ordnance plant near Denver to Public Buildings Administration for use of several agencies; and one section permits the sale of escheated property in the District of Columbia. Section 9 affects the design of Federal buildings, and, the committee believes, makes the principles of design more flexible.

I do not see how there can be any opposition to the bill. It has received careful consideration from the legislative committee, and is intended to make the operations of the Public Buildings Administration more efficient and economical.

The Committee on Rules has given this bill an open rule for 1 hour of general debate; and I know Members will have an opportunity when the bill is read, if they are so inclined, to offer germane amendments.

WISCONSIN POLITICS

I want to conserve the time of the House, Mr. Speaker; but I do want to say—and this, of course, is not politics—the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] a little while ago called attention to the fact that the Progressive Party of Wisconsin has rejoined the Republicans. I know the Republicans are desperate and will gladly welcome any one into their party; but I am afraid that this accession is not going to help them much. On the other hand, I must offer my condolences to those so-called Progressives who have forgotten their former beliefs, and what they once stood for. Had they really desired to act in accordance with their once proud platform of reform and progress, and in the best interests of the country, they would have joined and endorsed the Democratic organization. This is not the first time that Wisconsin politicians have made a mistake. I feel this will not aid them,

because it is not the people themselves, but the politicians, willing to forego the brave principles they once advocated for the sake of continuance in office, who feel they have a better chance if they join the Republican Party.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether the gentleman knows what actually transpired in that prearranged conference, so I do not know what additional light he can shed on the question.

All I know is what I read in the papers; but I do know the people of the State of Wisconsin, and that those who believe in progressive government and policies will resent the action taken. They will join with the Democrats to bring about the election of progressive and aggressive Democratic candidates.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. For a question, yes.

Mr. HENRY. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he feels he is competent to judge the political situation in Wisconsin?

Mr. SABATH. I think I am, and I will tell the gentleman why. Wisconsin adjoins the State of Illinois. I am familiar with the people of Wisconsin and know how they feel. I know that if it were left to the votes of the people and not to the gentlemen seeking office as so-called Progressives and Republicans, and who join any party just for the benefit of the votes, the people and the taxpayers of Wisconsin would show their resentment of this action; and they will show it in the next election.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is too far distant from Wisconsin—he could not know much about it anyway.

Mr. KNUTSON. I live closer to Wisconsin than the gentleman does. My district runs up to Wisconsin.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry, I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry; I cannot yield to either of you, because I have promised time to several of the Members, and I already have consumed more time than I intended. I want to be able to keep my promise.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman is going to talk politics we are going to have a quorum here to hear it.

Mr. SABATH. No; I am through.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman withdraw it if I yield to him?

Mr. CHURCH. No; I will not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will

count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixteen Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Adams	Fulton	Murray, Wis.
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gardner	O'Toole
Barrett, Pa.	Gathings	Outland
Beall	Geelan	Patterson
Bender	Gerlach	Peterson, Fla.
Biemiller	Gibson	Peterson, Ga.
Bloom	Graham	Pfeifer
Bradley, Pa.	Granahan	Philbin
Brumbaugh	Green	Ploeser
Buck	Gregory	Poage
Buckley	Hall	Powell
Buffett	Leonard W.	Price, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Halleck	Quinn, N. Y.
Burgin	Hand	Rabin
Campbell	Hare	Rains
Canfield	Hart	Ramey
Cannon, Fla.	Hays	Rayfield
Case, N. J.	Heffernan	Rees, Kans.
Chapman	Hoffman	Rizley
Chelf	Holifield	Robertson,
Clark	Holmes, Mass.	N. Dak.
Clippinger	Hook	Robertson, Va.
Cole, Kans.	Howell	Roe, N. Y.
Combs	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Corbett	Johnson,	Rowan
Courtney	Luther A.	Schwabe, Mo.
Curley	Kelley, Pa.	Sheridan
Daughton, Va.	Kelly, Ill.	Short
Dawson	Keogh	Simpson, Ill.
De Lacy	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Delaney,	Klein	Slaughter
James J.	Kopplemann	Smith, Ohio
Dingell	Kunkel	Somers, N. Y.
Dirksen	LaFollette	Stefan
Douglas, Calif.	Lane	Sumner, Ill.
Douglas, Ill.	Lea	Sumners, Tex.
Drewry	Luce	Talbot
Eaton	Lyle	Thom
Elston	Lynch	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	McGlinchey	Torrens
Fellows	McKenzie	Towe
Fernandez	Maloney	Vorys, Ohio
Fisher	Marcantonio	Weichel
Flood	Mason	Whitten
Fogarty	Miller, Calif.	Wilson
Forand	Miller, Nebr.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fuller	Morgan	Zimmerman
	Murphy	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 290 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

GRANTING FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATION CERTAIN POWERS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I did not wish to yield before because several Members had asked me for time, and if I had yielded it would have delayed matters. I used more time than I intended as it was. Unfortunately, a point of order of no quorum was raised and we did not save much time, which I regret. But the only reason why I could not yield was because I had promised time, and I did not want to be charged with using it up.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, there is no opposition to this rule. It seems that there is opposition to an amendment which is floating about and which, it is understood, will be offered to the bill, adding authorization for the further expenditure of \$50,000,000. There is nothing in the bill relating to that particular amendment. There was nothing before the Committee on

Rules, so far as that amendment is concerned, and if there is that type of amendment coming in, I, of course, know nothing about it. The amendment is an afterthought. It originated after the rule was granted.

I do not care to discuss the merits of the bill because the legislative committee are experts in the field and we will have its advice. I have no requests for time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LINK].

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up much time, as I feel that there are many matters more important before this House that need attention. I want to state briefly my reactions to an article that appeared in the *Herald-American*, Washington Bureau, March 6, and which was carried by the *Chicago Tribune* and some other local papers.

The aforementioned article inferred that I am a Communist because I signed a petition on winning the peace. I do not really know what a Communist is, and there are many others also who do not know. However, being in Congress for over a year, I have learned what one must do to be sure to keep the communistic brand from one's self. So here are my observations:

Today, we have several schools of thought in Congress on a just and lasting peace. One group is trying to formulate a United Nations Organization where all matters will be threshed out, adjusted, and agreed upon by all nations—and guaranteed by the United Nations. Another group—which shouts the loudest—is clamoring that a lasting peace can only be achieved by power politics in which a group of nations, including our own United States, will form a strong, military bloc to take over the world's trade—which, of course, would result in another world war. There is a small, but very powerful percentage of people within the United States who are blinded by the power of gold. They cannot see beyond this gold and, of course, to them everyone is a Communist who disagrees with them.

Now, in order not to be branded a Communist by the two latter groups, a Congressman must, first, be definitely against any nation whose form of government is not a constitutional government like our own; he must condemn every strike throughout the United States and set the blame on the unions; he must vote for antistrike bills regardless of how much they hurt—not only the union man, but all laborers; he must vote against all subsidies on the housing bill that is now before the Congress; he must vote against ceiling prices on everything; he must be against OPA and keep calling Chester Bowles a crackpot; he must vote no additional taxes on excess profits for industry; and must vote against all loans, credits, or even trade with other nations. In other words, he must definitely be for setting up an isolationist wall around the United States and for letting "the rest of the world go by." If a Congressman does not do these things, he starts off with the Communist brand.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everyone knows that any such reference to the gentleman from Illinois is ridiculous. I think we all appreciate the very dignified and firm statement he has made. Because of the dignity and firmness of his statement, his statement is all the stronger.

I have noticed a growing tendency not only here but elsewhere on the part of some persons to accuse everyone who does not agree with them of being either this, that, or the other thing. I have never referred to a colleague or anyone else as a reactionary. I think that is a sinister term. To refer to people as being conservative or ultraconservative or to refer to them as being progressive is perfectly all right. I have never referred to any man as a liberal because the term "liberal" in America is different than the same word in Europe. A liberal in Europe is usually one who tries to repress human dignity and the rights of mankind. That has been my experience and my observation. As a matter of fact, the most illiberal form of government in the world is the totalitarian form of government because it tends to submerge and destroy the dignity and personality of the individual in that thing called the state, whether it is dominated by the proletarian class or group or based on the theories of racism of Hitler with the state set up as the omnipotent authority. We have too much of a tendency on the part of some people to call someone a Communist because he may have a progressive outlook or to call someone a Fascist because he is a conservative. It seems rather hard for some of us who are Americans and are just trying to be Americans to be characterized as such. So far as the gentleman from Illinois is concerned, the House knows what a fine Member he is, and his firm and dignified statement strengthens our knowledge of the fact that the gentleman is one of the outstanding Members as well as one of the most courteous Members of the House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FISH HATCHERY, COMANCHE COUNTY, OKLA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 396) an act providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the city of Lawton, Okla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the fish hatchery property which is located south of such city in Comanche County, Okla., and which is now under the control of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this bill is identical to the House bill which was just passed and the purpose of calling up the Senate bill is to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill which was passed unanimously a few minutes ago.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill (H. R. 1389) was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances; in one instance to include a speech by Mr. Forbes.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the *Record* and include two letters.

TRANSPORTATION OF IRON ORE BETWEEN UNITED STATES PORTS BY CANADIAN VESSELS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5316) to repeal the law permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] advises me that he has conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and that there was no objection to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. BLAND. That is true. There is no objection to this bill, which was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. It simply restores conditions which existed on the Great Lakes with reference to shipping as they were before the war.

Mr. MICHENER. There are some Members who would like to know the attitude of the minority of the committee and just what the bill contemplates.

Mr. BLAND. The bill contemplates restoration of the conditions as they existed before the war. In order to carry iron ore we gave permission to vessels of Canadian registry to carry iron ore on the Lakes between American ports. It was distinctly stated at that time that it was done only to meet the conditions that existed on account of the war. The new season will open in about 30 days. The bill was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] and I promised to try to have it passed. They felt it was necessary to have it passed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942," approved January 27, 1942, as amended, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING CERTAIN POWERS WITH RESPECT TO SITE ACQUISITION, BUILDING CONSTRUCTION, ETC., TO FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5407) to grant to the Federal Works Administrator certain powers with respect to site acquisition, building construction, purchase of buildings, and other matters.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5407, with Mr. CRAVENS in the chair.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against portions of the bill in paragraphs (a), (b), and what was originally (c), proposed now to be made (b) by a committee amendment, on the ground that they constitute appropriations. Under the rule forbidding the reporting of appropriations by a committee without jurisdiction, I make a point of order against the consideration of the language on page 2, beginning in line 4, reading:

And the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of projects outside the District of Columbia.

Also on page 2, beginning in line 23, the last sentence of that paragraph which reads:

Funds for this purpose are hereby made available from the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of buildings outside the District of Columbia.

Under the rule, a point of order would lie against consideration of those portions of the bill, and I make such a point of order at this time.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations referred to by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] have already been made, and this money has been appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that the proper time to raise such points of order is not at the present time, but when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, I know that is frequently done, but I think the rule authorizes the point of order to be made at any time during consideration of the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that I think when he hears the explanation of the purpose of those two provisions he will be quite in sympathy with them, by reason of the fact that they are decidedly in the interest of economy in Federal expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that under the previous practice of the House, such points of order should be raised when the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have no objection to presenting them later, but I do not want to lose my right to present them by failure to raise them at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will not lose any of his rights.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Members of the House are aware of the fact that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has been considering a general public buildings bill; that the committee held hearings for 3 weeks on the measure, H. R. 4276; and that it will be necessary to have executive meetings of the committee in order to determine what the committee will report with reference to certain features and phases of that particular bill.

In the meantime there are certain emergency matters which deserve our very prompt attention in the interest of economy and in the interest of orderly procedure.

This bill which is presented today has the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, with the exception of an amendment which will later be offered and which was before the committee this morning and which the committee by a divided vote decided to submit for the consideration of the House.

The particular sections to which the gentleman from South Dakota has expressed his intention to raise a point of order are sections to which I should like to call your attention from their practical and economic aspects. And may I say that there is no appropriation involved in this bill as originally reported from the committee except the sum of \$750,000 for the completion of the central heating plant for which an appropriation has heretofore been made. This is in the nature of a further authorization which has resulted because of the higher cost of material and labor and certain alterations in the plans. The work is already in course of construction and it is quite evident that this should be authorized and this work completed. At the present time, for instance, we have six boilers used to furnish heat for the buildings that are heated from the central heating plant. All six of them are in operation on every cold day, and should one of them break down some of our central service buildings would be without heat.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman proceeds to the balance of the bill will he also discuss the proposal at the bottom of page 2 to make sums heretofore authorized for construction outside of the District of Columbia available?

Mr. LANHAM. I do intend to discuss it from the standpoint of its practical and economic aspects.

The \$15,000,000 involved in subsections (a) and (c) of the bill from the committee are concerned with appropriations which have already been made. I wish to call attention to what these projects are.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is it not true that this \$15,000,000 is not new appropriations but unexpended balances in the Federal Works Agency?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. The purpose of subsection (a) is both practical and economical from the standpoint of Federal expenditures and this money is to be used for the following purposes: A part of it is to be used for the extension of two marine hospitals, one at San Francisco and one at Seattle.

It has been brought to the attention of the committee that those hospital facilities are vitally needed. It is also intended to purchase three pieces of property with funds referred to in subsection (a). One of those is the parcel-post building at Indianapolis, Ind., which was constructed by private enterprise for the Government, according to Government plans and specifications, and which now under a temporary option can be purchased for what we pay in rent in just a few years for that very building.

Exactly the same situation exists in Boston, Mass., where there is another parcel-post station built for the Government by private capital in accordance with Government plans and specifications and which can be acquired in a similar way and at similar expense.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That does not quite go to the question involved and that is why I raised the point of order. The reason for making the point of order would be twofold. First of all, because all authorized projects call for consideration by the Appropriations Committee of funds to be made available. The second thing is that the unobligated balances of appropriations must originally have been made for a specific purpose.

The question that is involved here is whether these unobligated balances which had been appropriated for an intended purpose should now be diverted from that original purpose and made applicable to the new projects herein proposed.

Mr. LANHAM. If the point of order should be sustained, and if the gentleman is willing for the Government to go to greater expense in providing those facilities than under the provisions of this bill and using money already appropriated, of course, that will be his responsibility. But let me go on.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a further interruption?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not want all of my time used on a point of order. I want to explain what this bill does.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will indulge me, I do not want to be put in the position of objecting to marine hospitals because I am not objecting to them; but I am questioning whether or not money that was appropriated for some other purpose should be used for marine hospitals without justification before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LANHAM. As a matter of fact, the Appropriations Committee but for the action taken a few days ago was going to rescind this \$15,000,000. I appeared through the courtesy of that committee before the Appropriations Committee and that committee itself brought in a committee amendment to strike that item of rescission from the bill in order that this very procedure indicated here might be carried out by reason of the economy that it involved in Federal expenditures.

The third one of those buildings is in a midwestern city. I will not call it by name, because I do not in any way wish to complicate the action that the Government wishes to take. There is a building out there exactly adapted to governmental needs. A member of our committee lives in that particular city. We can acquire that building for 60 percent of what it would cost us to reproduce it, and we could immediately obviate the rent that we are paying in large sums in that city by acquiring this particular building. The time is short within which that trade can be made. I understand that private interests are offering more for that building today than the sum for which the Government can acquire it. These things are certainly in the interest of economy. We are going to acquire these particular structures, for which the rent in a few years will meet the cost, or we are going to have to appropriate greater sums of money to furnish the very same facilities. So I say that it is certainly in the interest of economy on the part of the Federal Government and for the orderly procedure of our Federal agencies to take the action that is contemplated in this bill. The committee heard this matter very much in detail, and there was not a dissenting vote with reference to these features.

The gentleman from South Dakota also calls attention to the item of \$2,000,000 which, it is true, is not to be expended outside of the District of Columbia, as recited on page 2, lines 20 to 23. That has reference to some land in the northwest triangle which the Government has long contemplated acquiring. As a matter of fact, 8 or more years ago a bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to acquire that very tract, and it is intended that eventually the Navy Department will construct a building on that particular site. It is necessary for the Federal Government in its plans to have this particular land, and the reason that we wish to acquire it now—and we should have acquired it sooner—is that the owners of that land are contemplating the erection of a very large structure, and I understand have their plans already drawn, and if they are carried through to fulfillment, then we are going to have to buy the land and the building, also. So, in the interest of economy, with this money which has already been appropriated, we wish to use a part of it for this governmental purpose.

Practically all of the other provisions of this bill are procedural. They were fully explained to the committee, and were acquiesced in unanimously by the committee.

Perhaps attention should be called to the exchange of land in New York, recited in section 3, where the Government is getting very much more land in the exchange, very much more advantageous to the Government, in order that the city of New York may carry on some of the projects that are being developed there. There is no controversy, I think, upon an investigation of the matter; that it is distinctly to the advantage of the Government for that trade to be made, and it is very seldom, I think, that the Government has any such opportunity in a transaction of this character in any city.

Then there is one small provision with reference to a piece of land that has escheated to the Government by reason of the fact that when an owner dies without heirs that property does escheat to the Government. It is a small piece of land with a house in bad repair, for which the Government has no use whatever, and the only sensible thing to do is to permit the sale of the land and the money to be covered into the Treasury.

Then we have a provision in the last section, section 12 of the bill, which is not entirely procedural, with reference to the transfer of certain land in Denver, Colo., where the Denver ordnance plant is being discontinued. I should like to read into the Record this statement of the situation. This information was given us by Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of the Public Buildings Administration. I think there is no finer, more conscientious, or more practical public servant in the Federal Government than W. E. Reynolds. Those of you who have had occasion to have contact with him will, I think, confirm that opinion. He says:

The space situation in Denver, Colo., is critical. Office space is needed immediately for the Veterans' Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Treasury Department, and other Federal activities. Approximately 1,980,000 gross square feet of usable office space is available in an ordnance plant located about 9 miles from the center of Denver, which has been declared surplus by the War Department. This property has been assigned to the Public Buildings Administration as disposal agency. The premises can be pressed into immediate use for the activities indicated and will eliminate from present consideration the construction of additional office space.

The Surplus Property Act of 1944, approved October 3, 1944, provides for utilization of surplus property by Federal agencies, under section 12 (c), as follows: "The disposal agency responsible for any such property shall transfer it to the Government agency acquiring it at the fair value of the property as fixed by the disposal agency, under regulations prescribed by the Board, unless transfer without reimbursement or transfer of funds is otherwise authorized by law."

The proposed legislation would permit the Public Buildings Administration to assume permanent custody and control of the property without reimbursement.

In other words, without the expense and detail of a great deal of unnecessary bookkeeping this vacated property would be immediately occupied by the governmental agencies enumerated in this statement by Mr. Reynolds. It is in the interest of time and economy that such a provision be inserted in this bill.

There are one or two of the procedural provisions which simply place into law provisions which are carried annually in appropriation bills.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I call the gentleman's attention to the language at the top of page 2. As I understand, there are several places throughout the country where conditions exist similar to those in the city of Kansas City, Kans., where the Government owns tracts of land upon which it had contemplated building structures. For instance, there was a post office. Then with the coming of war, of course, those plans had to be abandoned. As I understand, the language at the top of page 2 authorizes the Government now to go ahead and, where it already owns the land, draft plans for the contemplated building.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct, and that is in the interest of time when we consider a Federal public building bill. That is a procedural matter.

There is another thing that must be borne in mind, that the Public Buildings Administration, which is a very efficient agency of our Government, must in the meantime carry on with the work such as that contemplated in this bill or lose many of the very fine men connected with it, whose services are practically indispensable because of their long experience and familiarity with the work.

Mr. SCRIVNER. This planning is necessary because of change of conditions in many of these communities. Plans have already been drafted for this particular site, but it is found now that they are no longer adequate, yet without this they would have no means of preparing new plans.

Mr. LANHAM. That is absolutely true. That is the reason we put such authority in this measure.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. I call attention to the fact, because it is not in the bill as originally reported, that this morning, at an executive meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, by a divided vote the committee authorized the submission of an amendment as a new section, section 13. The committee decided that the matter would be submitted to the House and let the House pass its independent judgment on the question of whether or not it wishes to engage in construction activities of the sort indicated in the amendment. For your information, I will read the amendment which, in accordance with the instructions of the committee, will be offered for the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House, and if adopted will be before the House for its consideration:

SEC. 13. In order to alleviate the acute shortage of hospital facilities outside the District of Columbia, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make grants to public and private agencies for hospital facilities; *Provided*, That in no event shall the grant exceed 50 percent of the cost of a hospital facility to a public or private agency. As used in this section, the term "hospital facility" shall include without lim-

iting the generality thereof the construction, design, improvement, extension, equipment, alteration, acquisition, or reconstruction of hospital facilities. The term "public agency" shall mean any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision, municipality, district, authority, or other public body; and the term "private agency" shall mean any nonprofit private organization. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$50,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I have discussed this matter somewhat with the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]. This morning I conferred with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They had just concluded hearings on the bill (S. 191) to provide funds for hospital facilities. I wonder whether this bill does not conflict with that program in its entirety? Here are two bills, or at least two proposals, which are almost identically alike, with one exception. I notice this goes into private agencies and goes beyond public agencies.

Mr. LANHAM. May I recall to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that I am simply reading the amendment now for the information of the Committee of the Whole House because of the fact that under the instructions of the Committee on a divided vote the amendment will be offered for the consideration of the House. I thought I was in duty bound to give this advance information as to what the amendment provides. It will, of course, be discussed in the Committee of the Whole House when it is offered.

Mr. DONDERO. But it comes to the House simply on a divided vote of your committee and is not included in the report of the committee?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. It is not included in the report because of the fact that the action was taken only this morning.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the States generally have surpluses and that they are in better position financially to construct the hospitals than the Federal Government with its huge public debt outstanding?

Mr. LANHAM. That may be quite true. I am not arguing the merits or demerits of this amendment now because it will be offered later and evidently will be discussed. I simply thought I should advise the Committee that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds by a divided vote this morning authorized the submission of the amendment. It is not included in the bill as originally introduced. It is not included in the report of the bill. Consequently, I thought I should give the information that it will be offered.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it the proper or usual thing for the House now to undertake to include by way of an amendment an authorization more than

three times the amount of the authorization in the bill as reported? As a general proposition, I ask the gentleman: Is that altogether wise?

Mr. LANHAM. The bill as originally reported does not involve an appropriation of funds not already appropriated except the amount indicated for the completion of the central heating system.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, I understand that, but what is the total amount carried in the original bill as reported?

Mr. LANHAM. The amendment provides for \$50,000,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is more than three times the amount carried in the bill as reported, is it not?

Mr. LANHAM. Oh, yes; the committee's report has to do with \$15,000,000 already appropriated. It is merely a use of money already appropriated. The only new appropriation in the original bill and report is \$750,000 for the completion of the heating plant.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not generally true, and has it not been generally true that the justification for grants, whether 45 or 50 percent of the cost of construction, has heretofore been the inability of the States or the local subdivisions or private agencies to construct the projects to be erected?

Mr. LANHAM. I read the amendment as it will be submitted, which, as I recall, was upon a 50-50 basis.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes. I very thoroughly recall the language of the amendment, but I speak now of the justification which the committee offers for reporting, even by a divided vote, this amendment to the House.

Mr. LANHAM. As I stated, it is to be offered by a divided vote of the committee. The committee is unanimous with reference to the provisions of H. R. 5407, but the committee was not unanimous with reference to the submission of this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I believe the gentleman's answers are persuasive evidence as to why the amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to tell the House my reason for offering this amendment, later. I will take full responsibility, 100 percent, for offering the amendment, and leave it to the membership of the House.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that it is my purpose, when the amendment is offered, that the gentleman shall have time to make an explanation of it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] as to the surpluses of the States, it is my understanding that every State in the Union, with the exception of two, now has a surplus in its treasury.

Mr. LANHAM. I do not know just what the exact figures are in that regard, but I know that is true of a great many States.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I listened with great interest to the presentation of the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I have listened with great interest to his presentation in advance of the offering of the amendment, which will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from California, or offered by the committee as a committee amendment. Am I safe in assuming from the character of the statements just made by the chairman of the committee that he himself is in opposition to that amendment?

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the vote in the committee this morning was in executive session, and I do not think I am at liberty to disclose how members voted. Of course, when the amendment is offered, that will be time for discussing it with reference to its merits or demerits. There were several members of the committee who were not sympathetic and there were several members who were. So the committee decided by majority vote to submit it to the House.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman has fairly well answered my question. He is not too enthusiastic, but he is performing what he conceives to be his duty, without regard to his enthusiasm for the amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. I certainly think at this time that in reporting just what this bill includes, it was incumbent upon me to give the information that this amendment would be offered, because the amendment itself is not now under discussion but will be under discussion when it is presented as a committee amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may be necessary.

I simply want to concur in the statements made by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. LANHAM]. I want to stress the fact and call to the attention of the House that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds is attempting to save our Government some money. We are given an opportunity to purchase three buildings for which we are now paying a rental sufficient to pay for them in a period of not in excess of 7 years and most of them in 6 years. Also in this bill we are taking care of the purchase of some land which I believe we all admit is going to be necessary and to purchase it before new construction is made on that land so that we will not have to pay for the land plus the new construction. In this bill we are also managing to take care of an absolute need in Seattle and San Francisco for the extension of hospitals.

I believe there are no objections to the bill as it has been reported out of the committee. As my chairman has said, there possibly will be some objection to the amendment to be introduced by the distinguished gentleman from California authorizing \$50,000,000 for hospitals. This would be matched on a 50-50 basis;

in other words, a community would put up a million dollars and the Federal Government would put up a like sum. I wish to say to the Chairman that the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] presented it to the committee and is sincere in his effort. He has splendid arguments. He has worked hard for his community and he fully recognizes the needs not only of that community but the welfare of the entire Nation. The committee felt that his amendment was entitled to be given consideration on the floor.

I hope this Committee will give consideration to the amendment and especially do I hope that the bill will be passed as recommended by the committee.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. In regard to the provision that makes available \$2,000,000 for the acquisition of property outside of the District of Columbia, I notice the report set forth that this land would be obtained in the northwest rectangle in the District of Columbia. My first question is: Does the gentleman's committee undertake to identify the locality where the land will be acquired? And if so why does the committee select the most congested rectangle of the four in the District of Columbia?

My other question is: If the money is used to acquire land outside of the District why does the committee require that the acquisition be obtained from territory within the District?

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is my understanding, to answer the gentleman's question, that the land in question is within the District of Columbia. Is not that correct, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MCGREGOR. And it is land on which it is contemplated private construction will begin at an early date. I do not believe I am disclosing the proceedings of the executive session in saying this. A brewery occupies the site at the present time and new construction will be started very soon. The \$2,000,000 is for the purpose of acquiring the land itself, and the land is within the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. I may say further that as long ago as 8 years or more the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds issued a report recommending the acquisition of this land.

Mr. COLE of New York. Can the gentleman reply further as to the purpose for which this land is to be used after it is acquired?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not believe it has been definitely determined what type of building will be constructed nor what department or Federal agency will occupy the building after construction.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to the gentleman that the matter, of course, is before the Committee in a general public buildings bill upon which we have held hearings, but as yet no affirmative action has been taken.

It has been contemplated through the years as a site for a Navy Department Building. The Navy Department has no

building in the city of Washington except temporary ones.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then it is the recommendation of the committee that this land should be acquired with the idea that some day the Federal Government may build on it for some public purpose?

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman would look at the general scheme and plan of Federal construction in Washington he would see that it fits in necessarily with the general purposes. The desire to acquire it at this time is because of the fact that it can be acquired now more economically than it can be acquired later when we might have to purchase a very large establishment along with the land.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is this acquisition to be exercised under condemnation proceedings or by negotiation?

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is my understanding by negotiation. I may say also that this bill is the result of a bill that was introduced some months ago which carried several hundred million dollars for a Federal works program, but your committee took the position this certainly was not the proper time, on account of the need for critical building materials, to start a Federal works program. So we took that bill and went through it carefully and after long and extensive hearings we have submitted to you today H. R. 5407. We firmly believe this is the minimum bill that we can present to you and in turn save several million dollars to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact a great deal of this debate has centered about the question that I raised on the transfer of other appropriations to purposes herein proposed to be authorized, I should like to enter into that discussion a little at this time.

First of all, let me say that as far as the purposes for which it is proposed to use this \$13,000,000 proposed to be made available under subparagraph (a) of section 1, I think that the purposes sound laudable and the gentlemen who have explained them make a good case for those particular projects.

I am reminded, however, that in December when the Commissioner of Public Buildings, Mr. Reynolds, appeared before the appropriations subcommittee for independent offices, there was a great deal of testimony offered to the effect that public buildings outside the District of Columbia were in a sad state of repair, that during the war painting had been neglected, a great many heating plants were sadly deteriorated and needed replacement, that other repair and rehabilitation work was required in order that these public buildings may be put in economical condition for maintenance. The Bureau of the Budget reduced the request of the Public Buildings Administration for that purpose and before consenting to the transfer of \$13,000,000 from balances that would be available for the rehabilitation of public buildings, it seemed to me some justification should be made for the purposes to which it is proposed to

transfer the money. I think the gentlemen who have spoken made a good statement so far as statements go without any examination of figures as to the need for the marine hospitals at Seattle and San Francisco and possibly for this additional office building in a midwestern city to which the gentleman from Texas referred; however, I think it is not good appropriation practice to transfer money appropriated for a specific purpose to a new purpose without the record showing why that is being done.

With respect to the second item to which I directed attention, the \$2,000,000 fund in paragraph (c), to be renumbered paragraph (d) of section 1, I am still of the opinion that a point of order should be made against making \$2,000,000 available for that purpose. Whether or not this land should be bought is a question that ought to be answered fully and specifically. In discussion with the Park and Planning Commission in the District of Columbia and with the Public Buildings Administration of related questions, the appropriations subcommittee handling appropriations for this purpose has become aware of the importance of buying land when it is available; at the same time evidence before the subcommittee at various times has brought out the fact that there are a great many tracts of land in the District of Columbia that are now being used for purposes that are not necessarily to be served within the District of Columbia.

For instance, such institutions as the Boys Training School, the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, and St. Elizabeths Hospital occupy large acreages. The suggestion has been made that some of those activities might well be transferred outside of the District of Columbia, and that the land they occupy be made available for other purposes. So I think that no great harm will ensue if the \$2,000,000 proposed to be transferred by the language at the bottom of page 2 be objected to on the ground of a point of order in order that the actual appropriation of funds for those grounds be further considered.

We are told that it was intended to get this \$2,000,000 land for the erection of a Navy building. That, it strikes me, is a question that ought to be seriously considered by the Committee on Naval Affairs as well as by the appropriate committee dealing with appropriations. A good many people have raised the question as to what will be done with the Pentagon Building. Someone suggested to me the other day that he thought the Pentagon Building would serve both the War and the Navy Departments. I do not know that that is true, but at least, those are questions that should be determined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I said, that is a question that at least ought to be explored and we ought not to permit it to be handled here by what seems to me to be inadequate consideration.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Has anybody investigated whether or not this \$13,000,000 referred to on page 2 would be available for the purposes of going ahead with the items that they refer to without any language of appropriation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the chairman of the committee would answer that question.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it was thought so by the Public Buildings Administrator, who appeared before the committee.

Mr. TABER. Why do we have that language in here if they think the money would be available anyway? It would be surplusage under those circumstances.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, the money has already been appropriated, although this specific purpose was not stated. This is the designation of the purpose for which the appropriation would be made.

Mr. TABER. If the appropriation originally were made on such a broad scale that it could be used for this purpose, this language would be pure surplusage. That is what I would like to have settled, if we could, to find out where we are at and what it means.

Mr. LANHAM. I tried to make the best explanation I could in my original remarks with reference to the purpose of this subsection (a), which is certainly a very economical purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has again expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the question raised by the gentleman from New York, but I believe I understood him to inquire whether or not this money was surplus. It is my understanding that it is unobligated balances. The point of order that has been raised is that it should be referred back and reappropriated; is that the question?

Mr. TABER. No. My question was this, Whether the original appropriation of this money was on such a broad basis that it could be used for the purposes that are referred to in this subsection (a), or whether this language of appropriation was required in order to make the funds available. I understood the gentleman from Texas to say that he understood the Public Buildings Administrator said that it was not necessary to have appropriating language. If this is pure surplusage, it certainly ought to go out.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, the money involved in this subsection (a) could not now be used for the purpose for which it was originally appropriated because it would be inadequate and insufficient. It was an appropriation made before the war for certain construction which within the limit of costs that were then obtaining could not be built today. While we are considering general legislation with reference to a public buildings bill, we are trying, while holding that in

abeyance temporarily, to look after some emergency features here in the interest of economy for the Government. Unless these things, some of which I have enumerated, are carried out very speedily, it will be of no avail to have any provision at all with reference to them.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Does that answer the question of the gentleman from New York? We want him to be satisfied, recognizing that he is the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. I should like to know just what the funds, of which this \$13,000,000 is a part, were originally appropriated for?

Mr. LANHAM. The purpose for which money appropriated is to be used is a legislative matter rather than an appropriation matter. These appropriations have been made. The amount of money involved in subsection (a) would not be sufficient to carry on the construction for which it may originally have been appropriated, by reason of the additional cost of material and labor. Now we can use this money for a distinct and needed Federal purpose. This provides legislative authority upon which it can be used, the appropriation having already been made and the Committee on Appropriations itself having stricken this sum from the recent rescission bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The question which has been raised is an interesting one. I am wondering if the answer is not to be found in the report of the committee itself, wherein it states:

The Commissioner of Public Buildings reports to the committee that the Public Buildings Administration has about \$15,000,000 of unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of projects outside the District of Columbia.

That simply means that the Congress has heretofore appropriated money for specific construction purposes, to build buildings and structures outside the District of Columbia, and we have unobligated balances of about \$15,000,000. What they are now asking is that without having particular justification before an Appropriations Subcommittee they be permitted to take this \$15,000,000 of unobligated balances resulting from inability to expend or obligate appropriations made for specific purposes, and use those unobligated balances for certain other purposes; namely, to build extensions for two marine hospitals and to acquire certain other properties that have been listed by the gentleman from Texas in his original remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. As I understand, they propose to use \$13,000,000 of the \$15,000,000 for certain specific purposes, and propose to use \$2,000,000 of the \$15,000,000 to acquire certain land here in the District of Columbia. Obviously that \$2,000,000 is being put to a use that could not possibly have been encompassed within the original appropriation, because the \$15,000,000 balance was for

structures outside the District of Columbia. The whole situation, it seems to me, is very simple. These unexpended balances under the law should be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I assume that these \$15,000,000 were originally appropriated for the construction of buildings outside the District of Columbia and for their rehabilitation.

Mr. KEEFE. For a specific purpose.

Mr. MCGREGOR. They were appropriated to the Federal Works Agency, the same agency that is now requesting the further right to use this money that had once been appropriated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The money was for the construction of post-office buildings or for the rehabilitation of post offices and other public buildings. The money was either carried in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill or in a deficiency bill. But in any event the \$15,000,000 originally was for the construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia or for their rehabilitation.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is clear.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Congress wants to take \$13,000,000 of that and instead of using it for post offices and general repair of buildings that we already own and use it to make these extensions to these two marine hospitals and for this Federal office building, it should understand clearly what it is doing. Personally, I think a pretty good statement has been made for these marine hospitals and for this office building. But to my mind, there has been no justification established for taking \$2,000,000 of the \$15,000,000 and using it to buy land ostensibly to build a Navy building.

Mr. KEEFE. What we are doing in effect, and I think everyone will concede it, is appropriating on this legislative bill. That is what we are doing. It is simply a question to me as a member of the Committee on Appropriations as to whether or not we should permit that type of practice regardless of how worthy the situation may be. How much effort will there be on the part of the Public Buildings Administration to get a budget estimate for the amount of money necessary for the acquisition of these buildings and the repair of these hospitals and have it come up in the regular way to the Committee on Appropriations and let an appropriation be made for these items instead of doing it in this way, which will establish a very undesirable precedent? I read in the paper in the last 2 or 3 days that a dispute has arisen between the Bureau of the Budget and the Committee on Naval Affairs. The Committee on Naval Affairs, which is a legislative committee, as stated in the newspapers, is about to conduct hearings on a budget estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget to the House Committee on Appropriations, while at the same time the Subcommittee on Appropriations is conducting hearings on the question as to the adequacy or inadequacy of a Bureau of the Budget estimate. Now it all reverts back to

the question of committee jurisdiction as to whether or not we are going to have the Committee on Appropriations accused time and again on the floor of this House of legislating on an appropriation bill. Here we have the reverse. A legislative committee is coming in and making specific appropriations on a legislative bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. If we follow the gentleman's suggestion, the Committee on Appropriations could not now make appropriations because at the moment there would be no authorization for the appropriation. If this were done we would accuse the Appropriations Committee of legislating on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Then why do you not offer an amendment to this bill to authorize these items of appropriation and get a budget estimate in the normal way?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that in a sense at least the Committee on Appropriations has acted on this matter because I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and explained what was in this bill. On the basis of that explanation, the Committee on Appropriations acted by striking this money out of the rescission bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, it was with shock, amazement, and horror that I read in the paper of the drastic cut in our Navy, still our first line of defense, by the Bureau of the Budget. That cut was from \$6,325,000,000 to a final figure of \$4,224,000,000. This amounts to a cut of exactly one-third—a cut of one-third at the very time when world conditions are hanging on a delicate balance.

But my shock and amazement turned to white fury when I read of the unfortunate manner in which this cut had been made. Not only was it in complete disregard of the unanimous vote of the House on the composition of our Navy but it was made without even consulting the Navy itself.

I speak with conviction because I have just returned from a 28,000-mile inspection tour of our naval facilities in the Pacific. On this tour I saw the many vital naval establishments that we have in the vast expanses of the Pacific. I saw facilities and equipment in which we had spent millions—yes; billions—of dollars. I also saw the vital necessity of retaining these naval establishments. Until I made this inspection tour I had no idea of the terrific problems of the defense in the Pacific.

Now, I have returned to find that all of this for which we have not only spent billions of dollars but have sacrificed thousands of lives is to be literally junked from lack of funds resulting from the Bureau of the Budget's cut. Are we

to have a navy dictated by a bookkeeper—a bookkeeper's navy—or are we to have a navy that will be adequate to defend this country and its possessions?

Has the Bureau of the Budget made an inspection of our establishments in the Pacific? Did the Bureau of the Budget carefully weigh the requirements of these bases and their place in our national defense?

It is obvious that they did not, or how could they cut our Navy by one-third? Why did they stop at one-third? Why did they not make it one-half? If they are so interested in economy, why did they not eliminate the Navy? We might as well close up the establishments on the west coast and close up the establishments on the east coast, because it is folly to have establishments which cannot be adequately supplied.

We want no repetitions of Guam and Wake. We want no bases that cannot be defended because they are undermanned and without necessary equipment. Yet, the Bureau of the Budget cut would do that very thing.

A cheap Navy is the most expensive thing in the world. It is better not to have a Navy than a cheap one; a cheap Navy would be a liability.

May I remind the Bureau of the Budget that there are no bargains in national security?

But I am also incensed by the contemptible bureaucratic action in that it smacks of government by Executive order rather than orderly legislation. If this country is to be ruled by Executive order, or, more pointedly, by the Bureau of the Budget, we might as well close up Congress. The hearings, the deliberations, and actions of congressional committees, which have for years specialized in the study of certain vital problems of this country, are thus completely rescinded merely by a sharpened pencil of an anonymous bureaucrat.

Yes; the Budget has dropped its own atomic bomb on our Navy. Frugal men who pinch pennies—who do not even consult with the Navy, which has had the experience of fighting and winning the war in the Pacific—now have the temerity to attempt to dictate to the Navy, to the Congress, and to the people of this country without even asking their advice.

It is unfortunate that the President is receiving such disastrous advice—yes, disastrous because of its error in viewing national economy in pennies instead of human lives. There can be only one conclusion—"the brass hats have been supplanted by brass heads." It is tragic because it promises to be another case of too late and too little.

But I am happy to say that the House Naval Affairs Committee is not going to abdicate its duty to the people of this country and to take the action of the Bureau of the Budget laying down, but that it will continue its role of the "watch-dog on the hill" and will review the entire situation.

The action of the Budget Bureau represents bureaucracy at its worst. It will not be tolerated by the Congress, by thousands who fought this war, and by fathers, mothers, and families of those who fought.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from Sunday's Washington Post and a news item: [From the Washington Post of March 17, 1946]

NAVY BUDGET

As a rule, the pruning activities of the Budget Bureau serve a salutary purpose of enforcing economy in outlays, since Government spending agencies are inclined to overestimate their need for funds. But the \$2,000,000,000 gap between the 1947 Navy budget now being considered by the House subcommittee and the sum the Navy asks for is much too large to be regarded as a legitimate pruning operation. Indeed, it is difficult to find any excuse for a discrepancy of this size, especially as the Budget Bureau recommendations were submitted to the President without prior consultation with the Navy Department.

To be sure, nobody, not even the best-informed expert, is in a position to determine at this time what our naval expenditures are likely to be during the next fiscal year. If the plan for unification of the services had been approved, total expenditures for national defense, and for the Navy in particular, would have been affected. With that proposal hanging fire and with our naval-defense program still in a nebulous state, naval expenditure estimates are necessarily a matter of guesswork. However, since guessing has to serve for the time being in the absence of reliable estimates based on well-defined naval plans, final decisions as to appropriations certainly should not be made by the Budget Bureau. If that were done, the Bureau would be elevated to the role of policy maker in a field where it is not competent to act.

Although Secretary Forrester is justified in protesting against reliance on a bookkeeper's Navy, Congress has a responsibility to limit over-all naval outlays after consultation with naval officials. We are glad to learn that the House Naval Committee intends to explore the whole problem. The confusion that has arisen grows out of the topsy-turvy procedural methods that are being followed. Congress is being asked to vote funds to keep an establishment operating without knowing what the scope of its activities is likely to be.

In view of existing uncertainties, we think appropriations should be voted to cover the Navy's essential requirements and supplemented as naval plans assume more definite shape. Since long-range planning is difficult, often impossible, unless funds for execution are assured in advance, this is a far from satisfactory answer to a major dilemma, but it is preferable to acceptance of arbitrary Budget Bureau cuts.

[From the Washington Post of March 18, 1946]

NAVY FUND CUT FOR HOUSING, FLOESER SAYS—ASSERTS PROPOSED SLASH WOULD FORCE SCRAPPING 100 SHIPS

The Budget Bureau was charged last night with seeking to scuttle the fleet by attempting to provide \$800,000,000 for housing subsidies at the expense of the Navy.

The charge was made by Representative WALTER C. FLOESER, (Republican, of Missouri) member of the House Appropriations Committee, who said that \$260,000,000 of the proposed cut in Navy outlays for 1947 fiscal year since had been restored by the President.

"But the Navy's needs will still be short \$600,000,000 if the Appropriations Committee upholds the Budget Bureau, and I don't think it will," he said. He added that responsibility for the initial cut belonged to the White House, of which the Budget Bureau is a part.

FIRST ESTIMATE WAS SIX BILLIONS

According to FLOESER, who held a number of week-end conferences with naval officials,

the Navy originally figured on a \$6,300,000,000 budget. It finally decided it could get along with \$5,000,000,000 and presented these estimates to the Budget Bureau.

"The Budget Bureau tentatively approved the estimate," he said, "and then the administration came along with its housing program and decided it needed \$800,000,000 for subsidies. So the Budget Bureau told the Navy it would have to take that amount from its hide. That left the Navy with \$4,200,000,000. Subsequently, the White House decided it could get along with \$600,000,000 in housing subsidies and gave the difference back to the Navy."

PLOESER said that as the Navy's budget now stands, it will have to cut its plan for a 500,000-man Navy to 432,000. The size of the active postwar fleet, planned for 319 combat ships, will have to be cut by 20 percent if the Budget Bureau cut prevails.

Representative CHARLES A. PLUMLEY (Republican, of Vermont), ranking Republican on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Navy, claimed that the Budget Bureau originally cut the Navy's estimate from \$6,300,000,000 to \$3,960,000,000.

"The President restored \$264,000,000. That is the way the bill stands before my committee today," he said. "The Budget proposal would make necessary a very decided cut in the size of our fleet; compel the scrapping or demolition of around a hundred vessels; reduce naval personnel at least 10 percent; and put a stop to experimentation, research, and development of new aircraft and other weapons."

"The great majority of Americans will not stand for, nor tolerate, such a proposed scrapping of the Navy as the Budget Bureau would try to accomplish. We must be economical, but should not go crazy."

Chairman CARL VINSON (Democrat, of Georgia), of the House Naval Affairs Committee, said he was going to look into the Budget Bureau's action, and Admiral Chester F. Nimitz, Chief of Naval Operations, will testify tomorrow. He will be followed by Budget Bureau officials.

Meanwhile, a House appropriations subcommittee will be reviewing the Navy's budget in executive session.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently no quorum is present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Adams	Dirksen	Hébert
Almond	Douglas, Calif.	Heffernan
Anderson, Calif.	Douglas, Ill.	Hoch
Andrews, N. Y.	Drewry	Hoffman
Auchincloss	Ellsworth	Hollifield
Baldwin, Md.	Ellsesser	Holmes, Mass.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ervin	Howell
Barrett, Pa.	Feighan	Jarman
Beall	Fellows	Kelley, Pa.
BeMiller	Fisher	Kelly, Ill.
Bloom	Flannagan	Keogh
Bradley, Pa.	Flood	Kirwan
Brumbaugh	Fogarty	Klein
Buck	Forand	Kopplemann
Buckley	Fuller	Kunkel
Buffett	Fulton	LaFollette
Bulwinkle	Gamble	Lea
Burgin	Gardner	Lynch
Byrne, N. Y.	Gathings	McGlinchey
Campbell	Geelan	McKenzie
Canfield	Gerlach	Maloney
Cannon, Fla.	Gibson	Mankin
Celler	Graham	Marcantonio
Chapman	Granahan	Martin, Mass.
Chelf	Green	Mason
Chenoweth	Gregory	Miller, Nebr.
Clippinger	Hall	Morgan
Crawford	Leonard W.	Murphy
Curley	Halleck	Murray, Wis.
Daughton, Va.	Hand	Norton
Dawson	Hare	O'Neal
DeLacy	Hart	O'Toole
Delaney	Hartley	Patterson
James J.	Hays	Peterson, Fla.

Peterson, Ga.	Rowan	Taylor
Pfeifer	Sabath	Thom
Philbin	Savage	Thomas, Tex.
Ploeser	Schwabe, Mo.	Torrens
Powell	Sheppard	Towe
Price, Fla.	Sheridan	Vorrs, Ohio
Quinn, N. Y.	Short	Vursell
Rabin	Simpson, Ill.	Weichel
Rains	Slaughter	White
Rayfel	Smith, Ohio	Whitten
Rees, Kans.	Somers, N. Y.	Wilson
Ritzley	Spence	Winter
Robertson	Stefan	Wolfenden, Pa.
N. Dak.	Stewart	Wolverton, N. J.
Roe, N. Y.	Summers, Tex.	Zimmerman
Rogers, Mass.	Sundstrom	
Rogers, N. Y.	Talbot	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRAVENS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H. R. 5407, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 281 Members responded to their names, a quorum; and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended (40 U. S. C. 341-347), and as hereby further amended—

(a) For projects outside of the District of Columbia: To construct extensions to the marine hospitals at Seattle, Wash., and San Francisco, Calif.; to purchase and remodel buildings; and to establish the limits of cost and design new building projects where the sites are in Government ownership, notwithstanding the fact that appropriations for construction work shall not have been made. The total limit of cost for the foregoing shall be \$13,000,000 and the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of projects outside the District of Columbia are hereby made available for this purpose.

(b) To construct an additional building for the General Accounting Office, in square 529 in the District of Columbia, including a tunnel to connect the additional building with the building authorized by the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriations Act, 1941 (54 Stat. 1036), and without reference to section 8700 of the Revised Statutes, under a revised total limit of cost of \$19,600,000 for the two buildings. The unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the building are hereby made available for the enlarged project, including the acquisition of additional land, and contracts may be entered into for construction work within the full limit of cost pending additional appropriations.

(c) To acquire additional land in and contiguous to the area in the District of Columbia defined in the act of March 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 149), under a limit of cost of \$2,000,000. Funds for this purpose are hereby made available from the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of buildings outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. I make a point of order against the words beginning on page 2, line 4: "and the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of projects outside the Dis-

trict of Columbia are hereby made available for this purpose"; on the ground that it is an appropriation and coming from a committee not authorized to report appropriation bills to the House.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Has that money been expended?

Mr. TABER. I do not think so.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Has that money been appropriated, I mean.

Mr. TABER. Yes, I presume so, but I do not know; but not for this purpose.

The results of this point of order and two more which are to follow, would be that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, or someone else, would have to see that this was covered in a deficiency bill which comes up next week. That is about the result of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. No more than I have stated, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I understand a similar point of order is to be made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] with reference to the provision in section (c) as the bill was originally presented. In view of the fact that I should like to offer a perfecting amendment, I would appreciate it if the two points of order could be made at the same time, in view of the fact that they are based on the same exception.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the language in paragraph (b) and paragraph (c), and in paragraph (b) I make the point of order against the language beginning in line 15 which reads:

The unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the building are hereby made available for the enlarged project, including the acquisition of additional land, and contracts may be entered into for construction work within the full limit of cost pending additional appropriations.

Mr. LANHAM. May I inquire of the gentleman if he is referring to subsection (b) as printed in the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am referring to subsection (b) as printed in the original bill.

Mr. LANHAM. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is a committee amendment striking out section (b).

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the committee amendment has not been made. Consequently, I am making a point of order lest, by some slip, the amendment might not be accepted. I make the point of order that that would make appropriations for an unauthorized project by means of an appropriation reported by a committee without jurisdiction.

The limit of cost was placed as appears in the previous subparagraph; and there is an enlarged project for which an appropriation is made.

I also make a point of order against the language beginning in line 23 of

subparagraph (c) which reads as follows:

Funds for this purpose are hereby made available from the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of buildings outside the District of Columbia.

I make the point of order that that is in violation of clause 4 of rule XXI which states:

No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations.

Obviously that applies to the instant case.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from South Dakota kindly to reserve their points of order until we have a vote on the committee amendment striking out subsection (b).

Mr. TABER. I am afraid we cannot do that. Under the rules we must make the points of order now and have them disposed of. That is the only way we can protect our rights.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly concede the points of order. I do it reluctantly because I had hoped they would not be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Texas concedes each point of order?

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman from Texas does reluctantly concede the points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the two points of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are sustained by reason of the fact the language against which they are made is tantamount to new appropriations; and the language is stricken from the bill in each instance.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, strike out subsection (b).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 20, strike out (c) and insert (b).

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM:

On page 2, line 4, after the figures "\$13,000,000" insert a comma and the following: "And said sum is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purposes."

On page 2, line 23, strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "And said sum is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the points of order made by the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from South Dakota, and the statement on the part of members of the Appropriations Committee that this

should be an authorization rather than an appropriation, this is a perfecting amendment to meet the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The limit of cost for the site and building for the West Central Heating Plant, Washington, D. C., authorized in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, as amended by Public Law 371, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 23, 1941, is hereby increased to \$7,750,000.

SEC. 3. For the extension of the site of the Barge Office, New York, N. Y., and to permit the city of New York to proceed with the development of its highway system, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to exchange a portion of the site of the Barge Office for land owned by the city upon such terms and conditions as are mutually satisfactory to the Administrator and the city government of New York.

SEC. 4. The last two provisos of section 2 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended (40 U. S. C. 304b), beginning with the words: "Provided further, That the amount so charged against any Federal agency * * *" to the end of the section are hereby repealed.

Section 3 of the act of August 27, 1935, as amended (40 U. S. C. 304c), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to procure space by lease, on such terms and for such period not in excess of 5 years as he may deem in the public interest, for the housing of any Federal agency or agencies outside of the District of Columbia, except the Post Office Department, and to assign and reassign such space. To the extent that the appropriations of the Public Buildings Administration not otherwise required are inadequate therefor, the Commissioner of Public Buildings may require each Federal agency to which leased space has been assigned to pay promptly by check to the Public Buildings Administration out of its available appropriations, either in advance or during occupancy of such space, all or part of the estimated cost of rent, repairs, alterations, maintenance, operation, and moving: *Provided*, That when space in a building is occupied by two or more agencies, the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall determine and equitably apportion rental, operation, and other charges on the basis of the total amount of space so leased."

SEC. 5. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to maintain a survey of the use of Government-owned and leased office space in the larger metropolitan centers and the District of Columbia, including adjacent areas, and to study and determine the extent to which consolidation, reassignment, and reallocation of office space, including the cancellation of uneconomical leases, would be advantageous to the Government. Where he finds uneconomical use of space in buildings operated or leased by the Public Buildings Administration, he shall direct and prescribe its economical use or its surrender. Where such conditions are found to exist in space operated or leased by others than the Public Buildings Administration, he shall report his findings to those responsible therefor to the end that economical use of office space and cooperation between all agencies of the Government on space problems may be achieved. This section shall not apply to the Executive Mansion and Office of the President, buildings under the jurisdiction of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, buildings in or under the legislative branch of the Government, buildings structurally or domestically maintained by the Architect of the Capitol, or to buildings operated by the Post Office Department.

SEC. 6. That portion of the act of March 2, 1913 (40 U. S. C. 36), pertaining to the leasing of storage space in the District of

Columbia, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to enter into contracts for the leasing, for periods of not exceeding 5 years, of storage accommodations within the District of Columbia for the use of the several activities of the Government, subject to the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a), payable from appropriations that Congress may from time to time make for rent of buildings in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the authority granted herein shall also extend to the head of any department or establishment of the Government to which an appropriation is made specifically for the rental of storage accommodations within the District of Columbia."

SEC. 7. The Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to provide and operate public utility communications services serving one or more governmental activities, in and outside the District of Columbia, where it is found that such services are economical and in the interest of the Government. This section does not apply to the operation of cryptographic equipment or transmission of secret, security, or coded messages, or to buildings operated by the Post Office Department, except upon request of the department or agency concerned.

SEC. 8. The Commissioner of Public Buildings shall have exclusive authority in all buildings operated by the Public Buildings Administration to enter into contracts, upon such terms and conditions as he may find to be in the public interest and without securing competitive bids, for food services in buildings designed to include such facilities or where such services are subsequently found to be necessary; to establish rules and regulations for the operation thereof; and to make all sanitary inspections in connection therewith.

SEC. 9. Hereafter, subject to applicable provisions of existing law relating to the functions in the District of Columbia of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, only the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall be required to approve sketches, plans, and estimates for buildings to be constructed by the Public Buildings Administration, except in the case of buildings designed for post-office purposes which shall be approved by the Commissioner of Public Buildings and the Postmaster General.

SEC. 10. In the prosecution of construction projects or planning programs assigned to the Public Buildings Administration for which funds are provided by direct appropriation or transferred under authority contained in the act of June 15, 1938 (40 U. S. C. 265), an amount administratively determined as necessary for the payment of salaries and expenses of personnel engaged upon the preparation of plans and specifications, field supervision, and general office expense, may be transferred and consolidated on the books of the Treasury Department into a special account for direct expenditure in the prosecution of said work, such expenditures to be subsequently allocated and reported upon by projects in accordance with procedures prescribed by the General Accounting Office.

SEC. 11. The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to dispose of that parcel of land situated in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, described as lot numbered 71 in square 234, improved by premises 2218 Thirteenth Street NW., together with the improvements thereon, in such manner and upon such terms as he may deem to be for the best interest of the United States, to convey the said land, together with improvements thereon, to the purchaser thereof by quitclaim deed, and to deposit the proceeds of said sale in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 12. The Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to assume permanent

custody and control for the use of the Public Buildings Administration, without reimbursement, of that portion of the Denver Ordnance Plant, Denver, Colo. (which has been declared surplus and assigned to the Public Buildings Administration as disposal agency by the Surplus Property Administration), comprised of section 9, and the west half of the west half of section 10, township 4 south, range 69 west, the tract numbered 1, township 4 south, range 69 west (railroad right-of-way), located in section 4, and tract numbered 1) (pump-house property), comprising an area one hundred and five feet by four hundred feet located in section 34, township 3 south, range 69 west, together with all buildings, appurtenances, equipment, and supplies necessary for the maintenance, operation, and protection of the area described, and the Public Buildings Administration may operate the plant and assign and reassign space to such Federal agencies as may be accommodated therein.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. 13. In order to alleviate the acute shortage of hospital facilities outside the District of Columbia, the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make grants to public and private agencies for hospital facilities: *Provided*, That in no event shall the grant exceed 50 percent of the cost of a hospital facility to the public or private agency. As used in this section, the term "hospital facility" shall include, without limiting the generality thereof, the construction, design, improvement, extension, equipment, alteration, acquisition, or reconstruction of hospital facilities; the term "public agency" shall mean any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, any political subdivision, municipality, district, authority, or other public body; and the term "private agency" shall mean any nonprofit private organization. For carrying out the purposes of this section there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$50,000,000."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman like to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman.

It is apparent that this bill as reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds relates solely to the acquisition of buildings or facilities needed by the Federal Government, and for the use of the Federal Government alone. There is no item in this bill that pretends to go beyond that field. This amendment, however, goes far beyond the field occupied by the bill and proposes that the Federal Government embark upon the building of hospitals by grants to the States; hospitals not to be used by the Federal Government, but to be used by the States, the municipalities, or indeed, municipal subdivisions and private nonprofit institutions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I will gladly take the full responsibility for this amendment. Shortly prior to the close of the war a subcommittee, which I headed, conducted hearings in various places in the United States. It was found, after investigation in every community where hearings were held, that there was a great necessity and need for additional hospitalization. I felt that the time had come when we should make some effort to care for the needy in the various communities of the several States. We are today providing through Federal funds grants for highway construction in various States. We are providing Federal funds for many other items, such as agriculture, in making grants to the people. That money is not returned. We have now finished a great war, and the congressional district that I represent as well as the entire State of California is now faced with a serious shortage of beds for veterans. If this amendment is adopted, construction could be made to already existing hospital facilities and additional rooms could be provided to take care of the veterans now in California who are vitally concerned. It will take from 2 to 3 years until a sufficient number of veterans' hospitals can be constructed. In the State of California we have a million native-born veterans returning, plus another 1,400,000 who did not live there at the beginning of the war. Those veterans have married and their families are now increasing. The great need is to take care of the veterans at this time. This amendment would provide moneys, to be matched by the States and counties, to construct the needed facilities long before 1948, 1949, or 1950.

Under legislation recently passed we provided for new construction to make available 13,422 beds for veterans. How many were given to the State of California? Not one. It was the gentleman from New York who raised the point of order against this amendment, yet his State received 2,000 beds and not one went to the State of California, where there is a greater influx of veterans at the present time than in any other State. Here is a list of the beds that were provided for veterans in other States:

	Beds
Birmingham, Ala.....	500
Little Rock, Ark.....	500
Tallahassee, Fla.....	200
Fort Wayne, Ind.....	200
Grand Rapids, Mich.....	200
Ann Arbor, Mich.....	500
Saginaw, Mich.....	200
Tupelo, Miss.....	200
St. Louis, Mo.....	500
Southern Missouri.....	1,000
Poplar Bluff, Mo.....	200
Grand Island, Nebr.....	200
Metropolitan New York.....	1,000
Syracuse, N. Y.....	1,000
Durham, N. C.....	500
Charlotte, N. C.....	500

	Beds
Toledo, Ohio.....	1,000
Klamath Falls, Oreg.....	200
Philadelphia, Pa.....	1,000
Altoona, Pa.....	200
Erie, Pa.....	200
Harrisburg, Pa.....	200
Greenville, S. C.....	200
Chattanooga, Tenn.....	500
Bonham, Tex.....	50
Houston, Tex.....	1,000
Salt Lake City, Utah.....	500
Spokane, Wash.....	200
Madison, Wis.....	500
Beckley, W. Va.....	200
Peekskill, N. Y.....	492
Columbia, S. C.....	200
Fort Howard, Md.....	79
Dearborn, Mich.....	300

Today we have a need for 7,000 beds for the veterans now in the State of California. A majority of these boys are from your States. They are the sons of the people you represent. Our tubercular units in California are overcrowded. One hundred and twenty-five thousand veterans of this war are on waiting list trying to get some medical attention, yet today a point of order is raised against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time this matter has been discussed in the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I have brought the subject up time and time again for the past 2 or 3 years. If this amendment were adopted, there could be immediate construction of facilities in hospitals already constructed, and this amount of money could be matched by the State. It is not a case of one State absorbing all these funds. I do not want to see any veteran, regardless of what State he might be from, turned away because there are not proper facilities to care for him. He is home, he is wounded, he is sick, he needs medical attention. That is why I have offered this amendment, and I am very sorry the gentleman from New York has raised a point of order against it because I think this is worthy of consideration and demands the immediate attention of every Member of Congress.

I have seen millions of dollars voted by this body time and time again, for what? Nothing nearly as important as this. Some of those boys are coming back with two legs gone, or with an arm gone, with tuberculosis—injuries they received fighting our battles; yet a point of order is raised against an amendment that would permit assistance for communities that want to help, that want to provide 50 percent of the funds to help take care of veterans, veterans who are not their sons and daughters.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I understand that a bill containing provisions similar to those contained in your amendment passed the Senate last December 11, I believe it was, and that that bill is now before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and that hearings have already been concluded thereon and that the subcommittee is soon to consider that legislation in executive session. I do not know how soon, but I do know that the provisions of the bill are similar to the provisions contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Missouri that public hearings have been held on what is known as the Hill-Burton bill which has already passed the Senate, a bill that provides a 5-year program of hospital construction with Federal funds aggregating \$375,000,000 for a 5-year program or \$75,000,000 a year on a matching-fund basis. It is the intention of the subcommittee to complete hearings on that bill as quickly as possible in order that we may report it to the House. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this. I believe it is a tremendously important problem that faces us regarding hospital construction.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I ask the distinguished gentleman, a member of the subcommittee, if it has been determined to report the bill favorably?

Mr. PRIEST. I will say to the gentleman it has not been determined, but public hearings have been closed and no executive sessions have been held. It is the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee that the subcommittee and the full committee will report a bill to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am certain that the gentleman is in position to indicate the probable action of the committee. A favorable report would be regrettable. It involves potential expenditures which the country cannot possibly afford. We cannot go through another WPA.

Mr. ELLIOTT. You would rather have my amendment, would you not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would rather have neither, and I believe the country would rather avoid the policy which it would initiate and all the deficit spending and inflation which would inevitably accompany either proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wonder if I did not correctly interpret the

purpose of the gentleman as an attempt to get at what we find in our State delegation to be an emergency situation as far as the hospitalization of veterans in our State is concerned.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Plus civilians.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right. If the crowding of civilian hospitals could be relieved, it would, of course, make it possible for veterans to be taken care of much more easily in those hospitals until such time as we can get the facilities for veterans which are so needed in our State.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is true.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand, there is also a shortage of civilian hospital facilities in the State of California?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It seems that only a short while ago while I was with the subcommittee investigating the congested conditions in California that there was quite a rumpus taking place in the legislature of California as to what the State was going to do with \$300,000,000 surplus. Now if there are inadequate hospital facilities for civilians, why do not the State and the communities of the State of California, with this \$300,000,000 surplus, take care of these needs? If it is a question of hospitalization for the veterans, then the Federal Government should step in, but certainly the State ought to be willing to take care of its own civilians.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. IZAC. Is it not true that if the Veterans' Administration would build their own hospitals and take the veterans out of State institutions that we then would have some room perhaps in these State institutions?

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. IZAC. At the present time we are taking care of a good many of Uncle Sam's veterans in these State institutions. The California delegation is agreed to a man that the Veterans' Administration should build hospital facilities for the veterans and all the veterans should receive the same treatment.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRAVENS). The Chair is prepared to rule. This bill deals with authorizations for acquisition and construction purely of governmental property and for the Federal Government alone. The amendment offered by the committee to the bill deals with authorizations for appropriations for construction of hospitals by private institutions and by public institutions other than Federal. The original bill deals solely with Federal Government construction for exclusive Government uses. The amendment is a departure and would bring in new matter not covered by the original bill.

Therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, it is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRAVENS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5407) to grant to the Federal Works Administrator certain powers with respect to site acquisition, building construction, purchase of buildings, and other matters, pursuant to House Resolution 553, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include certain newspaper items.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and to insert certain statements and excerpts.

ALBERT W. JOHNSON

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 560, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5413) to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the bill H. R. 5413, which has for its purpose to accept the renunciation made by Judge Albert W. Johnson of his right to receive retirement, by the fact of his resignation. Briefly, this is a case where a judge from Pennsylvania is actually under investigation by the Committee on the Ju-

diciary with a view to filing impeachment charges. Pending that investigation, this judge resigned. Following his resignation he wrote a letter to the Committee on the Judiciary in which he renounced all right to receive any retirement pay in the future. I have understood, although it does not appear in the report, that subsequent to that time the judge has indicated that he wanted to recede from that position.

The purpose of this bill is to accept that renunciation of retirement pay and have the Congress to provide that he shall not receive any retirement pay.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. SMITH], has stated clearly what this is all about. I only want to supplement what he has said by saying that this is a bill to which no one objects. There is not a single man or woman in the House who would think of voting against it. Judge Johnson was investigated by order of the House. Extensive hearings were held by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Voluminous printed hearings were filed with the committee. The full committee has reported to the House. The report has been printed and it does not recommend that the House take any action, because Judge Johnson has resigned; he is out. There is not anything the House can do with Judge Johnson, except to send the case to the Senate for trial. This trial would take possibly 3 weeks in the Senate and cost from \$40,000 to \$50,000; and all that the Congress would be doing, would be kicking at the place where Judge Johnson used to be. Impeachment is an ouster proceeding; a judge who has resigned cannot be ousted. The time of the House should not be consumed in discussing the moot question as to why he left the bench, for he is gone. In my opinion he would have been impeached if he had not removed himself. He has been indicted. I think two of his sons have been indicted with him and a dozen or two other people up in that part of Pennsylvania have been indicted with him. They are now awaiting trial in the courts and certainly American jurisprudence and good judgment and ethics do not warrant trying a case of conspiracy against all of these defendants some of whom may be innocent, on the floor of the House where none of them have an opportunity to be heard. That is not American justice. I cannot for the life of me see why anyone wants to debate this matter when we are all agreed, and I hope that the distinguished gentleman, the author of the bill will ask unanimous consent that the bill be accepted. This bill can pass by unanimous consent.

Judge Johnson waived his retirement pay in writing; he is not getting any retirement pay now. He has served notice, however, that he was incapacitated, I think mentally or physically, or under duress, or something, at the time he waived the right to receive retirement pay after resigning. The committee has been advised that the Treasury Department and the administration of justice have notified Judge Johnson that his name will not go back on the

pay roll unless the court so orders. This proceeding cannot have any effect on what the court will hold; so it is a moot question. To me it seems strange that we should be asked to take the time of the House to listen to irrelevant debate. If there is anybody against this bill I hope the author of the bill will ask him to state his opposition. If there is opposition to the bill then I am for discussing it. I am not opposed to the rule, but I think it is a needless exercise of the legislative power. The report of the Judiciary Committee is not up for action. Just one question is involved and in the final analysis the courts must settle the question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire further time?

Mr. MICHENER. No.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5413) to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5413, with Mr. SULLIVAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there should be no opposition to the adoption of this bill, but I think it would be of interest to the Members of the House, the public, and those connected with the judiciary of the Nation if a brief statement were made about the investigation that has been conducted by the Judiciary Committee of the official conduct of the judges in the middle district of Pennsylvania.

During the latter part of the Seventy-eighth Congress a resolution was adopted authorizing the Judiciary Committee to make this investigation. It was not completed by the end of the last Congress, so another resolution was adopted at the beginning of this Congress. The inquiry was made, and without intending to flatter anyone, it was a very thorough and painstaking investigation. It was conducted by a subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT], and myself, as chairman.

When we first commenced our investigation we were confronted with the fact that for the past 13 or 14 years there had been some five or six investigations made of the conduct of Judge Albert W. Johnson of the middle district of Pennsylvania. An investigation was made in 1932 by the FBI; another one in 1934, an-

other in 1936, another in 1938, and also one in 1942. All of these various investigations developed many irregularities, a whole lot of smoke, but nothing tangible enough to result in indictment or impeachment was ever uncovered. Mr. Sauthoff, a former capable Member of this body from Wisconsin, first called the attention of Congress to what was going on in this district. Mr. Sauthoff was most helpful to the committee.

Shortly after this resolution was passed, the committee went into the middle district of Pennsylvania and visited Scranton and Wilkes-Barre. We reached the agreement that nowhere had we witnessed less respect for the Federal judiciary than we found there. Lawyers, if possible for them to avoid it, disliked to get their cases in the Federal courts. They tried to keep their clients from bankruptcy court, because the general feeling was that there was a lot of crookedness going on in the Federal courts in that district. Justice was for sale and the one who paid the highest price received the decision. With all that, we were unable to get our finger on anything definite in the beginning.

I may say in this connection that we did not have the cooperation of any bar association in the middle district of Pennsylvania. Perhaps one reason for that was that various lawyers had assisted in some of these previous investigations which had not resulted in anything concrete. Thereafter damaging retaliation was resorted to by Judge Johnson against those who had participated in those investigations.

I am satisfied that if they had had a strong bar association, which was active and vigilant, to see that the judiciary was kept clean and pure in that section, this terrible situation could never have existed. The committee asked the Department of Justice to let Mr. M. H. Goldschein take a leave of absence in order to be employed by the committee, and to assist the committee in making its investigation and conducting the hearings. Mr. Goldschein did a most remarkable job. He worked diligently day and night and in the face of the most adverse circumstances. He showed great tenacity in staying with the assignment in face of obstacles which would have discouraged anyone else. Finally, largely through the hard and capable work, the perseverance, the untiring effort, and determination of Mr. Goldschein as counsel for the committee, the committee began to unearth sordid situations in which one development led to another, until finally the whole story picture of what had been taking place in that district since 1926, the time when Judge Johnson was appointed, was unfolded and developed. I am sure the Committee joins me in expressing thanks to Mr. Goldschein; the Judiciary Committee has done that, and commend him for the very excellent job he did for the committee and for the judiciary of the country in this investigation. Mr. Goldschein is a capable and studious lawyer. In addition he has the very fine qualities of courage, tenacity, and energy to a remarkable degree.

We also secured the services of E. W. Burke and E. W. Pressley, who took

leaves of absence from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and they worked very diligently and intensely in tracing down the many ramifications in connection with the activities of this judge and the crooks who joined him in this judicial racket.

Mr. Chairman, I should also say that the press deserves recognition in connection with the result of this investigation and its successful conclusion.

The committee would go from one lawyer to another in the middle district of Pennsylvania in the search of definite facts which we know must exist in view of the general unhealthy condition. No bar association was willing to help us. Many times we would meet lawyers who would say, "We know it is a rotten, crooked set-up from beginning to end, but do not quote us, because we have to practice law here." We were unable to find any attorney in the whole district who was willing to come out in the open and help the committee to clean up the most corrupt situation that has existed, or that could possibly exist, in any judicial district. But we had the assistance of the press, and the press deserves a great deal of commendation in connection with this matter; especially the *Scranton Times*, and a reporter with the *Scranton Times* by the name of George Martin. This man, back in 1928 or 1929, became convinced that Judge Johnson was a crooked judge; that justice was for sale; that it was a disgraceful situation; and he stayed with it from that time until the final clean-up came about. All kinds of influence was used on this reporter to make him desist in his efforts but he was determined and he stayed with the job. Here, indeed, is a gentleman of the press at his best. It was largely through information that he gave the committee that we got the clues which enabled us to get to the heart of the case. I think that those who have charge of awarding the Pulitzer prize, or whatever great recognition may come to a newspaperman for doing a great public service, should not overlook the tenacious and effective reporting that this reporter, George Martin, did in helping uncover the dastardly conduct of this judge and of those who surrounded him.

The *Scranton Times*, in the face of obstacles and, of course, pressure, to get it to relent in its exposé of this judge, kept up its fight to see that the whole matter was brought out into the open and that justice was dealt to those guilty of misconduct. Freedom of the press and integrity of reporting have, by this example, shown their great virtues as American institutions. George Martin and the *Scranton Times* have earned a high place in our country's journalism.

They were relentless and fearless in exposing him, even though he occupied a position of great importance and, of course, could exert a great deal of influence which might have weakened the will of a less determined and patriotic people. Also, the *Scranton Tribune*, while not as active as the *Scranton Times*, should be given a word of praise

in this connection. It printed the news fearlessly.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the distinguished gentleman that I have followed this case with considerable interest not only as a Member of Congress but as a lawyer. I compliment the committee and its counsel on the splendid work they were able to do in uncovering this scandalous situation in the Federal judiciary. However, I confess that I find it somewhat difficult to understand the necessity for this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. It seems rather strange that in view of the record that has been created in this matter, involving a man who, the evidence discloses, has been guilty of the derelictions this man Johnson has been guilty of as a United States district judge, the Congress of the United States, after he has officially resigned and officially, in writing witnessed by his counsel and submitted to a committee of the Congress, renounced all of his rights to pensions under section 260 of the code, should now have to pass legislation, which in effect is perhaps *ex post facto* in character, providing that after July 14, 1945, no payment shall be made to this man. It is now March 1946. I should like to have the gentleman explain that to me, despite the admonition of the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, because there are Members of Congress here, and I know I have talked with a number of them, who are not disturbed over the action that should be taken, for they are all in agreement that this fellow ought to be kicked out and be kept out and should not receive a dollar from the Treasury of the United States, but are wondering if there is some sort of judicial precedent for the sort of action we are taking here today.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the question of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin who is an exceedingly able lawyer, and will try to answer it as best I can. The chronological order of what took place is this. Judge Johnson was at first defiant of the committee, but after the investigation got under way he submitted his resignation to the President under the Retirement Act, and it was accepted on July 3, 1945. Under the Retirement Act he would continue to get his salary but he thought that having resigned we would desist from our investigation. However, we went on with it. On July 14, 1945, when he was on the witness stand and trying to undergo cross-examination, very unsatisfactorily to him, he and his counsel decided that he should submit a letter to the committee relinquishing his retirement salary under the Retirement Act and withdraw as a witness. No influence whatsoever was exerted by the committee to secure the letter. After that was done and the committee had

the matter under consideration, as the report shows we found him guilty of many impeachable offenses, and would have impeached him except for the fact that he had resigned and relinquished his retirement salary. We concluded that although impeachment would do three things: First, remove him from office; second, take away any emoluments either of salary or retirement; and third, make it impossible for him to hold an office of honor under the United States, the judge had impeached himself as far as the first two of those points were concerned, and that his age and the committee report would probably prevent him from ever holding any other office.

Following that time, however, when the committee had made its report and condemned the conduct of the judge—and I am sure the gentleman has read the report—he sent the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrative Officer of the Supreme Court and the committee a letter saying that he was not himself, that he was not of good mind at the time he did it, and he now needed the money, so he attempted to withdraw his relinquishment.

Our theory about the matter is that there is some question, since the judge would be entitled to his retirement pay under the law, whether, if he later withdrew his renunciation, we could prevent him from getting that pay unless we passed legislation such as is offered here. That is the reason this legislation is here. We anticipated he might do just what he did; that is, relinquish his pension and later on after the matter had died down say that he was mistaken about it and that he wanted his pension and that we would be faced with some question as to whether there was an estoppel, which would prevent him from later receiving his pay. As you know, there are cases where people have taken voluntary salary cuts and later have asked for the full amount and have been given relief by the courts. We thought that in order to be safe and in order to make sure that neither he nor his estate would ever receive any compensation that this bill should be passed. It makes it stronger than it otherwise would be. It may not be necessary, but it certainly does not do any harm.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not a fact that at the time he sought to withdraw his waiver of retirement he raised a question of duress at the time he originally made the waiver?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will include later his letter to the committee and to the Secretary of the Treasury. He claimed that he was not himself and was under duress and what not. So I think it is safer to do this. Gentlemen, this is a flagrant case where a Federal judge sold justice. I think this Congress, this House, ought to do everything possible to keep him or his estate from ever receiving one dime from the Treasury of the United States.

The letter of Judge Johnson, referred to above, in which he attempts to renounce his renunciation, is as follows:

LEWISBURG, PA., February 8, 1946.

The Honorable HENRY P. CHANDLER,
Director, Administrative Office of the
United States Courts.

The Honorable PRESTON DELANO,
Comptroller of the Currency of the
United States.

The Honorable FRED N. VINSON,
Secretary of the Treasury of the United
States, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: On the twenty-ninth day of June, 1945, I submitted my resignation as United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania to the President of the United States of America. The resignation was accepted on July 5, 1945, subject to the provisions of section 260, amended, United States Judicial Code, title 28, section 375, United States Code annotated, providing for the payment of salary in full for the remainder of my natural life, by reason of the fact that I had served more than 10 years and had reached the age of 70 years.

On July 14, 1945, I executed a certain written instrument purporting to be a waiver of the salary to which I was entitled under the retirement provisions of the act of Congress cited above.

At the time I executed the aforesaid instrument purporting to be a waiver of a right established by act of Congress I was ill and incapacitated physically and mentally, and therefore unable to realize the import of my action.

Being in need of the money and now being competent to realize the ineffectiveness of my act, I hereby revoke the aforesaid written instrument above mentioned, and hereby make demand upon you for my vested statutory rights established by the act of Congress above cited and due me from the date of my resignation. A copy of my resignation and a copy of the acceptance thereof by the President of the United States are hereto attached.

Respectfully,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

Copy to: The Honorable Thomas C. Clark,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

If Judge Johnson had merely retired and had not resigned he probably could not legally waive his salary or pension, but he resigned and did not retire. The rule against a diminution of salary under article 3, section 1, of the Constitution was to attract fit men to the bench and insure their independence of action. The pension provision after resignation was not on the statute books when Judge Johnson took office in 1926, so it did not attract him to the office. Having resigned, he cannot hold court, and therefore the independent judgment argument does not prevail.

It should be pointed out that no member of the Judiciary Committee investigating this matter had any conference with Judge Johnson; no agreement was reached with him, no suggestion was made to him that he relinquish his rights under the Retirement Act. The facts of the situation are set forth on pages 917-921 of the hearings.

Judge Johnson was represented by three able attorneys. Mr. Bigelow asked that Judge Johnson be withdrawn as a witness. I, as chairman of the subcommittee, stated that Judge Johnson was before the committee on purely a voluntary basis; that we wanted to give him

a full opportunity of being heard and of presenting witnesses on his behalf, but if Judge Johnson did not want to be heard, that was a decision for him to make. It was made clear to Judge Johnson and his attorneys that the committee would accept and file any letter Judge Johnson wanted to submit, but that there would be no understanding or agreement as to any course the committee might thereafter take. The truth is that Judge Johnson and his attorneys saw that the evidence of judicial misconduct and of wrongdoing was so overwhelming that any statement Judge Johnson might make would only further convict him. At the time Judge Johnson withdrew as a witness he was being interrogated about a little tin box, which he kept in a bureau drawer in his home, and in which he claimed he had placed \$20,000 in bills. The testimony of FBI agents had shown that Judge Johnson had received more than \$24,000 in excess of any known sources of revenue. This tin-box story was manufactured to try to account for this excess money.

It appears, however, that during the time Judge Johnson claimed he had this large sum in the tin box he was borrowing money from banks at 6-percent interest; he was making an emergency loan on an insurance policy and he was generally hard-pressed for funds. Judge Johnson's counsel knew that no reasonable person would believe this fantastic story about the tin box. Furthermore, Judge Johnson had claimed that he made about \$2,000 per year as honoraria for speeches he delivered and yet on cross-examination he was unable to give but one instance of having received any money for making speeches, and furthermore an examination of his books showed that, over a period of 11 years he had received only \$211 for speeches.

Judge Johnson simply could not stand up against the indisputable records, reports, and overwhelming evidence, which showed him to have been guilty of selling justice, of conspiring with others for his own financial benefit. It was under these circumstances that he submitted his letter to the committee and withdrawing himself as a witness.

That was in July of last year. The report of the committee was recently released. Judge Johnson, on February 19, 1946, prepared what he called an answer of Albert W. Johnson to report of subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is amusing to contemplate that a Federal judge would withdraw as a witness because the going was tough, and would refuse to try to explain charges that had been brought out in the testimony when he had an opportunity of doing so, and then later undertake to file an answer.

I think I should also call the attention of the committee to the fact that Judge Johnson was guilty of petty crimes and offenses. They were petty in view of the financial amount involved, but they were important in showing the general attitude of this judge toward his office and toward the administration of justice in general. Judge Johnson had some apartment houses at Lewisburg. He

practically forced his employees to rent apartments in his buildings. He charged them excessive rentals. Whenever they got salary raises the rent went up. Judge Johnson had painting and repairs done, for which he paid no wages to those who made the repairs. The workers were paid by being appointed appraisers or given some position in bankruptcy or receivership cases. He required his secretary and other court employees to act as his chauffeur, to drive his family places where they wished to go, and do menial work around his home. A blacker picture of utter disrespect for his office and of unconscionable misconduct in office has never before been related to this Congress.

In summing up the conduct of this man I can do no better than quote part of a paragraph from the report of the hearings. It is as follows:

Here, then, is a part of the record of the maladministration of justice by Judge Albert W. Johnson as it appears from the evidence submitted herewith. From this record as well as from other evidence developed during the investigation, your committee finds that for more than 15 years Judge Johnson used, and permitted his court to be used, as a medium in the formation and operation of an unconscionable, a despicable, and a degrading conspiracy against the administration of justice; that he did so knowingly, wickedly, and maliciously; that he notoriously engaged in the barter and sale of court offices, notably in the appointments of attorneys, trustees, receivers, and similar offices and appointments, usually in consideration of a share in the salaries, fees, or other compensation paid such appointees; and that such compensation and fees generally were fixed in proportion to the amount of the take; that his decisions, decrees, orders, and rulings commonly were sold for all the traffic would bear; that his judicial conduct generally was tainted with fraud and tended to lower regard for the judiciary and the courts in the public opinion and esteem.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I concur in everything that has been said by the previous speakers. I wish however to call to the attention of the Members of the House that there was a technique which existed in the middle district of Pennsylvania, something the like of which I have never seen in my experience as a member of the bar. There we had a situation wherein three persons, a beer salesman, a lawyer and a son of the judge, through machinations that were quite unique, were enabled with impunity to sell justice in the United States district court, and to barter for and obtain appointments to positions of trust, of persons whose only qualification need be that they would split their compensation with their sponsors.

In the committee report—House Report No. 639—it is significant that in all of the cases commented on, invariably the names of Jacob Greenes, John Memolo and Donald Johnson are ever in the background, pulling the strings, manipulating the affairs of litigants, even dictating the decisions of the court. Sporting people of this country will always recall that great triumvirate of the baseball diamond that made the "double

play" immortal. When the ball passed "from Tinker to Evers to Chance" and the unfortunate baserunner and the equally unfortunate batsman were inevitably called "out." In contrast thereto, we found another triumvirate, a sordid one, that polluted the courts of the middle district of Pennsylvania, making the "double cross" its precept. When the loot passed from Greenes to Memolo to Donald Johnson, the unfortunate plaintiff and the equally unfortunate defendant were inevitably declared "out" by an unscrupulous umpire whose decisions were arranged for in advance.

The resolution now under consideration is in the nature of a validating act. Never before has the Congress faced a similar situation, because resignations before probable impeachments have not taken place since the passage of the laws providing for retirement and pensions. It emphasizes the necessity of amending the pension and retirement acts, to make the benefits therefrom not applicable to an official who resigns "under fire."

If, as in my judgment is the case, the resignation and renunciation of a pension by this judge is irrevocable, then the passage of this bill is but an empty gesture. If, however, the assent of Congress to the conditions and considerations by which the investigation was terminated is necessary, then it seems it is the only method short of impeachment whereby an unworthy judge may be denied annual remuneration for his career of judicial misdeeds.

I therefore hope that this bill will pass by a unanimous vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes, but I do want to call the attention of the House to quite a peculiar situation in which we find ourselves.

No one who reads the record will doubt that Judge Johnson is guilty of conduct that could not be called good conduct in the meaning of constitutional provisions. The only question is, now that he has resigned, how can we assure ourselves and the country that at some later time he or his estate shall not be able to collect the pension provided for a judge who resigns? I think this bill should be passed. I am not certain, however, that it will be a defense if this matter gets into the courts. I am afraid the court might consider this something in the nature of a bill of attainder; as an attempt by a legislative body to decide a case of a private individual without resorting to the method of trial provided by law.

I think, however, if the judge should bring an action, either a suit for damages or an action for mandamus to compel payment, there would be a defense which the Government could set up. I believe these pensions are gratuities. Of course, the Government cannot be sued without its consent. The Government has given consent to be sued in certain contract cases. If any individual furnishes services or material to the Gov-

ernment he is entitled to sue in the courts for payment. However, I believe a pension given to a judge is a gratuity, and I doubt if the courts would entertain any suit brought by Judge Johnson for the money provided under the statute, providing pensions in certain cases.

To my mind, this situation suggests the necessity for amending the general law covering pensions in cases of judges who have resigned or retired. Nevertheless, I believe the bill should be adopted for whatever good it may do in this particular case.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. This legislation would not be a bar to his impeachment, if that should become necessary?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Oh, no, indeed.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—POSTWAR REQUIREMENTS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk on the subject of postwar requirements for national defense.

It is possible to approach the subject from different directions and to arrive at varying conclusions. But reduced to its simplest elements, the immediate problem of the United States is this:

First. We have emerged victorious from World War II only to find ourselves still living in an insecure and warlike world.

Second. If we are ever to have a chance for peace, and for the continued pursuit of our peaceful ways of life, we must recognize the possibility of swift and devastating attack by those who envy us and seek their ends through war.

Third. It follows necessarily that as a requirement of our national defense, to which we are all committed, we must have both men and weapons at least equal in effectiveness to those of any nation whose purposes we cannot trust.

Although we may differ as to the formula, we can agree as to the basic requirement.

We need an army, a navy, and an air force strong enough to meet a sudden threat from any quarter.

What do we have?

It is believed that the Navy as it stands substantially meets this requirement. Like the Army, it is passing through a period of readjustment and reshuffling. These readjustments follow inevitably in the wake of any war. But in an emergency, the Navy could shake down quickly. For all practical purposes, it appears ready to fight.

We have the word of General Eisenhower that the Army is not—through no fault of its own. Less than a year ago it was recognized by all nations as the most formidable and effective military machine the world had ever known. Today it is largely demobilized. It is an army

in flux, facing an uncertain present and a more uncertain future, in distressing contrast to its recently glorious past.

This discussion, therefore, is confined chiefly to the Army and its needs, and to the broader aspects of our national defense problem.

This is not an academic subject, nor is it something that can wait. Other things can wait, but the national defense cannot. It should be approached with a sense of urgency. Whether we attack the problem as a whole or take it step by step, we must act definitely and act soon.

THE PROBLEM AND THE SOLUTION

As far as the Army is concerned, the problem is divided into two parts:

First. The occupational job and the requirements of the interim Army.

Second. Our over-all national defense requirements, looking beyond the next few months.

The first half of the problem is simple. At most, the manpower requirements as we have it from General Eisenhower may entail extension of the Selective Service Act beyond May 15.

The second half of the problem entails broader decisions. There are two major questions which confront Congress in this connection:

First. Unification of the armed forces as recommended by the President.

Second. Peacetime military training for all able-bodied civilians as they reach military age.

Without delay we must also go into the question of rebuilding our organized reserves, including a strong and well-trained National Guard, to provide an immediate striking force to back up the Regular Army in any sudden emergency.

The National Defense Act makes adequate provision now for the National Guard and Organized Reserves. They will be rebuilt and reorganized gradually or rapidly as men are recruited or channeled into these organizations through the operation of a civilian training program, and as Congress provides the necessary appropriations for these purposes.

Legislative steps are necessary, however, in the over-all picture, before we are ready to meet the defense problem confronting this country.

Congress should accept the responsibility of meeting now the questions involved in the national security.

THE INTERIM ARMY

What of the interim Army?

The interim Army is an army in transition. It is passing from a war basis to a peacetime basis. As planned now, it will shake down into an army which can perform the several functions required of it in the immediate postwar period.

These functions include occupation of formerly hostile areas in Europe and the Far East; the manning of overseas bases; development and maintenance for our own defense of a small but powerful striking force able to meet a sudden attack or threat of attack; the provision of additional forces required by our obligation under the UNO Charter, ready to act in concert with others at the call of the Security Council; the performance of

necessary housekeeping or administrative duties; the maintenance of communications and the training of new recruits and reserves.

For these purposes it has been estimated that we shall need—and, of course, shall have—an Army of approximately 1,500,000 men as of July 1, 1946.

This figure bears no relationship either to a permanent peacetime Military Establishment or to the force which might be required in the tragic event of another war. It is not to be thought of in terms of a postwar Army. It is simply the Army we shall have on hand to do the immediate job required of it now—this year—and as things stand, with hostilities in abeyance in most of the world.

Our Army at present represents what has been described as the remnant of the combat Army which won the war, reorganized and reduced to an interim Army with a totally different mission. Its chief job is to help preserve the peace won in combat until such time as this responsibility can be shared with others under the UNO formula.

Beyond this lies the Army's long-term, peacetime problem of preserving the peace so won and so secured during this interim postwar period.

For this ultimate peacetime mission Secretary Patterson and General Eisenhower said on March 13 that we shall require an Army of 1,070,000 officers and men as of July 1, 1947, to be maintained at this figure until withdrawal of occupation forces. This can only be considered as a conditional or tentative estimate, based on the known factors of the moment and the best forecasts of future requirements. We cannot know definitely what size Army we shall need in the future until we know what its job is to be.

This subject is being studied constantly. These studies will continue.

But we shall be wise if we remember constantly that any estimate of military requirements in the present troubled state of the world may have to be revised on short notice, in response to changing conditions. The figure may be higher or lower, depending on whether the world turns toward war or peace.

Our conclusions can only be based on what we see in the developing pattern of world events.

Tragically, at the moment, we can see neither clearly nor far, and what we do see is not reassuring.

DEMobilIZATION

Now what of the present?

What of demobilization?

Where does the current demobilization rate leave us?

How are enlistments running?

What is the present state of Army morale?

Let us look first at demobilization, and since we must be realistic, compare the rate of our own demobilization with that of the Soviet Armies which so recently fought beside us. Russia is the only major power whose present military resources are comparable with our own.

On VE-day there were approximately 8,300,000 men in the uniform of the American Army. Since that date more than 6,500,000 of these men, or close to

80 percent of the total, have been separated from the service. By July 1, 1946, another 1,000,000 will have been discharged or be on their way home for release.

Thus without the continued operation of Selective Service and a high rate of voluntary enlistments—perhaps the best answers as to how the men in the Army really feel about it—we would shortly have no Army at all. Certainly most of the men who did the fighting will be out of uniform except as they have reenlisted or as they may reenlist between now and July 1.

As of today, we have an Army of approximately 2,750,000 men, made up of these three groups: The men not yet discharged, those who have enlisted or reenlisted since VE-day, and those drawn into the Army in recent months through the continued operation of Selective Service. Since 1940 we have introduced, roughly, 10,000,000 men into the Army, yet by July 1 only about one and a half million of these will remain in the service. And of those who do remain, 150,000 will be officers, many of whom will become officers of the Regular Army and make it a life career.

Soviet Russia ended the war with an estimated 12,000,000 men in its army. Where are they now?

As always where Russia's military measures are concerned, the figures are guarded with close and deliberate secrecy. But we know that no demobilization plan has been announced for these vast military forces—the largest ever assembled by one nation. We know further that no great proportion of these armies have been demobilized. It is thought that Russia still has 8,000,000 or more in uniform.

By simple computation of the visible Soviet forces in Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Germany, the Near East, and in Manchuria and the Far East, the conclusion is inescapable that a majority of the men in Russia's wartime armies not only are still in uniform but that more than half of them are serving beyond the borders of Russia in adjacent territory.

We know further that Russia intends not only to continue military conscription as a national policy, but to increase and strengthen the Red army in every way.

In Russia every able-bodied man from 19 to 50 years of age is trained and liable for military service. Women also may be—and are—called to the colors for auxiliary and special services with troops in the field. Soviet draftees served from 2 to 5 years in the active military or naval establishments. Thereafter they go into first- or second-line reserves, depending on age, from which they may be called to active service at any time.

These reservists are required in addition to spend from 1 to 3 months training in refresher courses from time to time, depending on their age classification.

Nor is this all, for training for war under the Soviet system begins in childhood. It starts in the fifth year of secondary school, from 13 to 15 years of age, and consists of 2 hours a week in

school. Thus a Russian draftee normally will have had from 4 to 6 years of preservice military training before he attains manhood or puts on a uniform. And this at an age when he is most impressionable.

For the long view, we have merely a brief announcement that the Soviet peacetime force will be 4,500,000, as against hardly more than 1,000,000 for the United States at a comparable time. And perhaps it is well to remind ourselves that Russia's scientific and industrial development will be much more rapid in the future than in the past.

Putting it all together, it is clear that Russia now has three times as many men under arms as we have, that in peacetime they plan an army four times as large as ours, and that they have a permanent conscription system which will feed men into the Soviet armies of the future in numbers more than sufficient to meet any goal which may be set for them, regardless of the rate of demobilization of the combat forces in World War II.

This is perhaps to be expected. We shall not attempt to compete with them in the size of our Army, nor need we do so.

Now what kind of an army do we have, made up as explained of the three groups which at present comprise it?

First of all, we know that at the present rate of voluntary enlistments, which have totaled more than 600,000 since the recruiting drive started last fall, well over half of the interim American Army on July 1 next will be made up of volunteers. We know, too, that most of the gripes and healthy emotional explosions which have been voiced since the end of hostilities have come from men who are either out of the Army now or will be out very shortly.

The low point in Army morale was probably reached in December and January, at the time of the mass meetings in all theaters, attended by men anxious to get home.

Americans are a free and independent and peaceful people. They will always fight when war comes, and will always win. But when it is over they want nothing so much as to get out of uniform and back to their families and civil pursuits, and enjoy the peace for which they fought. And they are restless until they do.

ARMY EFFICIENCY AT LOW EBB

Army efficiency is at a low ebb, but the cause bears only an indirect relationship to morale. It is found chiefly in the results of a demobilization policy which gives first consideration to the individual, and puts the Army's needs and the country's safety last.

As General Eisenhower bluntly expressed it after inspecting many of our Army bases and Army units, we have dropped so low in military efficiency that it will take a year to bring many units back to the 1940 level, when we first began to train men in large numbers for possible war.

We have demobilized too fast for our national security. In helping men to get home to their families, we were willing to disrupt completely the finest military machine ever constructed. We are losing our trained men before we have had

time to train others to take their places. This is a democracy and we wanted our men at home with their families as quickly as possible after the shooting ended.

This is the real explanation of the situation in which we find ourselves 7 months after the end of hostilities.

THE REMEDY

The remedy is to build and train a new army on the foundation of experience in World War II, and in the light of the facts as we find them in a disturbed world which is already talking of World War III.

And do it as fast and as effectively as we know how.

We should for this purpose help the Army to secure whatever its spokesmen need in manpower to meet its immediate or interim responsibilities.

We must either make sure that voluntary enlistments will supply this manpower, or continue the selective-service system for whatever period is necessary to meet the minimum requirements of our national defense.

There is no other alternative if we are to provide for our own security and make our necessary contribution to a peaceful world.

We must put speed back of the reorganization of the National Guard, to bring it to the strength estimated by our best military minds to be necessary for our defense requirements—now given as 572,000 men.

In order of importance, we must reach our decision with respect to Selective Service first.

We can talk of atom bombs and pilotless aircraft and jet propulsion and rocket projectiles and all of the other paraphernalia of modern warfare, but in the end must come back to the simple fact that wars are fought by men. It is men who use these weapons, and men who direct their use.

We must give the Army, Navy, and Air Corps the men they need to give us the protection we know we need.

And back of that we must be prepared in our homes and hearts and on the production line to back them up.

This much we know. No man can say on what day we shall again be required to defend ourselves. History shows that even crushed and beaten nations sometime recover rapidly. History shows that new world powers arise. And history shows that our friends in one war may become our enemies in the next. War now moves too swiftly to take chances. We shall not again in our time have the opportunity to prepare for war after the first blow has been struck.

We can be strong or we can be weak.

By being strong we can best avoid war.

The choice must be made soon.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order that I may enlarge somewhat upon the position taken by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE]. I share his views as a result of having had some experience in the matter of the removal of public officers. I think it would be quite academic

for me to say to the distinguished members of this Judiciary Committee that a person who acquires a public office either by election or by appointment has a property right which cannot be taken away from him except in the manner prescribed by law. In other words, the law prescribes the manner in which that property right may be terminated. It may occur as the result of resignation, it may occur as the result of removal by conforming to the provisions of a removal statute; it may occur as a result of death, or in the case of Federal judges as I understand the law it may occur as a result of impeachment proceedings. I happen to know of no other procedure for the removal of a Federal judge and the termination of any property rights which he may have in the office which he holds other than by indulging in a process of removal through the medium of impeachment. This judge has seen fit to resign. This in itself would terminate his right to the office. Due to his tenure of office and his age he acquired a right to compensation under the so-called retirement law.

It was then sought to terminate his rights under the retirement law by having him file a renunciation of his rights. This is set forth on page 921 of the hearings. What I am fearful of, and I think the RECORD should show it, is that the legislation which we are now attempting to pass on or about to pass may not legally affect the purposes its sponsors hope to achieve. I have no objection to the passage of this bill. I sincerely do not know whether it will do any good or not. It certainly cannot do any harm. It will show the intent of the Congress.

The judge, being a smart old individual, has seen fit to disavow on his renunciation. He says that it was procured through coercion and by the exercise of duress upon him. He says, "I now renounce my renunciation." He serves notice upon the committee and upon the Congress that at some future time he intends to try to retrieve the property right which he may have in this so-called retirement fund.

What are we doing by the passage of this legislation? That is what is bothering me. I would like to see the Congress affirmatively end it so that never again will there be a chance of this gentleman, if he may be called such on this record, ever receiving a dollar from the Federal Public Treasury. Perhaps on the passage of this bill and the status of his renunciation those in authority issuing checks will not pay any money to him, but he can go into the Court of Claims, I suppose, and do what Watson, Lovett, and Dodd did—sue the United States Government for the amount of his recovery and thus raise the issue. Then would be raised the clear-cut issue that the gentleman from Iowa has so clearly brought before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, even though it may take some time, it does seem to me that the gentleman from Iowa has raised a question which I in-

tended to raise before he took the floor, namely, that here is a bill which a court some time later might hold to be a bill of attainder in which we as a Congress, or in which a committee of Congress, are in effect convicting this man of an offence, thus separating him from his property right in office. We are convicting him of an offence without a trial. I do not profess to be an expert in this field, but I would like to make sure that this man is removed from the Federal pay roll and I want to make certain that the course which the Constitution sets up is adopted. If it means impeaching this "old buzzard" then we ought to take the time and make the effort to impeach him in order to make sure he nor any of his relatives ever receive a dollar, if the facts as disclosed by the record are true as I have been privileged to read them.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Following this so-called renunciation, the executive branch of the Government that had charge of making the payment said that they would not pay and they are not now paying. I would like to know what the gentleman thinks of this question: Are these payments on pension gratuities? If they are, then he would have no standing in court to claim them.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, that is a very close question. A Federal judge makes no contribution, as I understand it, to the fund out of which these pensions are paid.

They are in effect, perhaps, gratuities, in view of the fact that he makes no contribution. But the Congress has set them up and they attach to and become part of the emoluments of office to which he was appointed. I do not think that we would want to rest the case upon the shallow and thin ice of contention that he is not entitled to all of the perquisites of office merely because the payment of the pension might be a mere gratuity. I think the bill ought to pass, but I think the record should be clear that someone has questioned the possibility that in the future this bill may cause us considerable trouble and alarm. I personally would be pleased if impeachment proceedings were instituted. It would serve a good end and justify any expense involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I take it that most of the Members have read the report and are familiar with the case. I listened attentively to what the gentleman said who just preceded me, and I realize that there are some questions that perhaps might come up later. But, at least, it will put the laboring oar upon the judge himself. I think the facts would substantiate the charges of impeachment; there is no question about that. As I understand the law to be, in an impeachment case conviction is only in the nature of a removal from office, and a prevention of the one convicted from ever again holding office of

honor or trust or emoluments. The judge, being some 72 or 73 years old, of course, and having resigned, in my opinion will never again be elected to office; he will never again seek office, especially in light of the record made up there in his own home community where the grand jury has indicted him. And, it would cost the taxpayers of the country a large amount of money—some estimate not less than \$40,000—to carry out the wishes of the gentleman who preceded me and which he says should be done, and then you would not accomplish any more than except what is trying to be accomplished, even if the impeachment court was to render a verdict of conviction, or what we are trying to accomplish by the passage of this legislation; that is, to prohibit him from receiving retirement funds; in other words, it is the taxpayers' money, which he contributed nothing in the world to, and with a record like he has made no one could truthfully say that he earned it by his past services. Far be it from that; we know he did not earn it. The record clearly explains that. So it occurs to me that the best thing that this Congress could do would be to pass this resolution, and then the laboring oar is upon Judge Johnson himself. It will at least be an expression of the Congress that where a man appointed to high honor and trust so conducts himself in a manner as explained in the report in this case, he is not entitled to receive gratuitously the funds which the Congress some time in the past made available, as well as others serving in the capacity in which he was appointed and supposed to have rendered faithful service.

To me, the greatest injustice that can be perpetrated upon a public is the injustice perpetrated by a public official occupying a position of public trust given him by the authorities of his country, yet who fails to live up to that trust, but on the contrary conducts himself in a manner showing himself not to be worthy of such trust.

There are some deep questions of law that might be raised here. The Congress passed the act granting retirement pay without any contribution upon his part, and I believe the Congress can take it away. I know it should be done and I know of no way to do it except by the passage of this act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the merits of this case with respect to the conduct of Judge Johnson have been thoroughly developed before the Committee of the Whole today; consequently, I have no disposition to go back and refer to those matters. However, I should like to call attention to a situation which has developed with reference to Judge Johnson's voluntary renunciation of his right, if any he had, to a pension from the United States Government.

Judge Johnson now takes the position, after having renounced his right to a pension, that at the time he did so he was sick both mentally and physically, to the extent that he did not realize or appreciate the nature or quality of his

act. The facts of the case, I think, will refute that contention on the part of Judge Johnson thoroughly and completely.

After the case was developed against him, after he knew what the facts were, after he had attended the hearings—and he was given an opportunity to attend all of them—Judge Johnson submitted himself to a hearing here in Washington for cross-examination. After a comparatively brief cross-examination, and when the cross-examination began to get a little close to home and bear down on him pretty hard, he asked permission of the subcommittee hearing the charges to withdraw himself as a witness in these proceedings and not be required to submit to any further examination as to his conduct.

In my judgment, that establishes the fact that Judge Johnson knew that what he had done was wrong, that he had no defense to the charges that had been developed by the committee against him, and that he was taking the best way out he could to avoid further embarrassment to himself, his family, and his colleagues in the middle district of Pennsylvania who had been associated with him in his improper conduct. However, Judge Johnson says when he did that, and when he later filed this letter, a copy of which I have here now, renouncing any claim to a pension from the United States as long as he might live, he did not know what he was doing on account of his physical and mental condition.

The committee made no suggestion whatever to Judge Johnson that he should file this letter of renunciation. The sole motivating thing behind this letter came from the suggestion of Judge Johnson himself and his counsel, by whom he was represented at all of these hearings.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman if it is not correct that Judge Johnson was represented by three eminent counsel at that particular time?

Mr. CRAVENS. That is what I was just coming to. At that time his counsel said they might want to make some representations with reference to Judge Johnson's evidence. We suspended the hearings, they went out, and they came back with the suggestion that Judge Johnson would like to submit a letter renouncing all claim to future compensation from the United States by way of pension or otherwise.

At the time that was done Judge Johnson, as I recall, was represented by three lawyers, who were with him at the hearing and had been through all these hearings with him. They were able lawyers. They were experienced lawyers. They showed by the conduct of Judge Johnson's defense that they were no amateurs at this business. According to the information that the committee had concerning the professional standing of those gentlemen, they were some of the ablest lawyers in the middle district of Pennsylvania. There were three of them. My recollection is that throughout these hearings Judge Johnson was represented

at all times by not less than three able, capable attorneys, and sometimes he had as many as five representing him. They apparently advised Judge Johnson to take this course. This letter of renunciation was submitted at the suggestion and at the request of his own counsel. Now Judge Johnson has the temerity to come in and say, after requesting that this be done and after getting the heat of this investigation off of himself by making this proposition and after being advised by three to five able lawyers who knew Judge Johnson and knew the facts that had been developed against him and after he voluntarily requested the right to take such course, that he did not understand. He now wants to back out of it. It is, under the circumstances, so ridiculous for Judge Johnson to now come in and say that he did not know what he was doing as to warrant little consideration of his plea. The information of the committee is that Judge Johnson's son consulted with him. He is also a lawyer. There was no request by the committee for the letter, no suggestion that the committee would consider it at all. He asked permission to file the letter of renunciation. When we granted his request and took him up on his own proposition, he contends he did not know what he was doing. Gentlemen, it is so preposterous I do not think the slightest bit of attention should be paid to it.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. Is it not true that inasmuch as the Retirement Act for Federal judges was not passed when Judge Johnson took office as judge, he could not consider the gratuity as part of his compensation?

Mr. CRAVENS. That is true. But the fact is that this is not retirement pay. There are two kinds of compensation that a judge may receive after becoming inactive—one is retirement pay and the other is a gratuity after he has resigned. Judge Johnson did not retire. He resigned. He is no longer a judge, either active or retired, and is not entitled to compensation as such.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I take this additional time to further call the attention of the committee to a fact brought out by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO]. The cases which hold that under article III, section 1, you cannot reduce a judge's salary during his term of office makes such a finding on the basis that such compensation must have been an inducement for the acceptance of the office. In this case, since the retirement act had not been passed at the time, it was not an inducement for the acceptance of the office. This case probably falls within the Supreme Court case of *O'Malley v. Woodrough* (307 U. S. 277), in which the Court held that a Federal judge was subject to income tax and thereby overruled two previous cases that had held that he was not so subject. But if this judge had merely retired, you would have a different situation. It would have been part of his salary. But, having resigned and also in view of the fact that the retirement act was not in

effect at that time, I think this bill when enacted will effectively prevent him from receiving any emoluments of the Retirement Act.

I want to call the attention of the Committee to the other recommendations of the committee. The committee recommends that the Retirement Act be amended so as to prevent possible repetition of the situation we have here.

Also, it recommends that this practice of selling assets of bankrupt estates, where the purchaser is to pay the cost of administration, be discontinued by enactment of Congress. That was one of the things that made it possible for a great many of the frauds that were perpetrated to be carried out.

Also, Mr. Chairman, the committee investigated the conduct of Judge Albert L. Watson, who was the other judge in that district. As is shown in the report of the committee, which has been filed with the House, we found that Judge Watson had been negligent in certain matters, but that there was nothing in his conduct to question his integrity or his honesty or his fitness to carry on as a judge.

The committee has filed its report, consisting of some 1,000 pages, and also about twice that many pages of exhibits. We also have filed a report, and I think many Members of the House will enjoy reading the hearings and the committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That after July 14, 1945, no payment shall be made under section 260 of the Judicial Code to Albert W. Johnson (or to his estate), formerly district judge of the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, who resigned as such judge on July 3, 1945, and who, on July 14, 1945, renounced and relinquished his rights under section 260 of the Judicial Code to receive the salary therein provided for judges who resign after having served at least 10 years and having attained the age of 70 years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose in doing this is to suggest to the chairman of the subcommittee that the record show completely the circumstances under which the renunciation or relinquishment of pension or retirement rights of Albert W. Johnson were made. I think that should be stated in detail. We know, of course, that there was no coercion used, but I think it might be well for the record, because one can never tell when in the future the considerations of this debate might be referred to by some other agency, or the courts, to have that aspect of the proceedings completely set forth in the debate that took place this afternoon.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Committee on the Judiciary has reported fully to the House on the impeachment proceedings against Judge Johnson. It is House Report No. 1639, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. Everything that might be said about this judge is found in that

report. That report, of course, could be brought before the House if there was anything to discuss.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does that report go into detail in connection with the circumstances about the renunciation or relinquishment of his rights?

Mr. MICHENER. It does. That is why I said this whole thing is moot.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has answered my question by referring to the report and including it in this debate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts took this time, because I think it is important that that matter be made clear. On pages 920 and 921 of the hearings of the investigation is set forth what took place. Briefly, it is this, that the attorneys for Judge Johnson asked for a recess. Then they asked for a meeting with the committee in executive session, and they told us what they had decided to do, and, of course, their reasons for it, that many things had come out that they did not know about. We made it very clear that under no circumstances would we enter into any agreement or understanding about what we would do; that all we were doing was making an inquiry and if they wanted to file any letter with the committee, it would be put in the record and would be given whatever consideration it might justify. That was made amply clear to them.

Then, I also want to call attention to the fact that after the letter was filed with the committee, I made this statement:

Very well. If I have not made it clear on behalf of the committee, I do want to say that the committee, of course, receives any communications affecting the case.

I also wish to make it clear that there are no conditions pertaining to its acceptance. Of course, the committee will give all matters in the record due consideration. If there is nothing else, the committee will stand adjourned.

That statement was made in the presence of Judge Johnson and of his counsel.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if it is not a fact that not a member of the subcommittee that held the hearings talked to Judge Johnson either collectively or singly about this matter; that the only conversation that the committee had with him with reference to it was through three excellent gentlemen, and lawyers, too, who were representing him, and at no time did Judge Johnson discuss it with the committee or any member of the committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to.

Mr. MICHENER. To make a long story short, the judge is out, the judge is not receiving his retirement pay, the judge will not receive his retirement pay, and the committee was advised by the

Treasury Department and the Bureau of Administration of Justice presided over by Mr. Chandler that the only way the judge could ever get the money here in question would be for the courts of the land to so decree; and any action which we may take here today in my opinion can as matter of law in no way affect the conditions as they were so far as the judge is concerned in this matter on July 14, or whatever the date was that he resigned.

Mr. McCORMACK. My purpose in rising, of course, was to have incorporated in the debates the evidence in relation to the renunciation or relinquishment of his rights, because on some future occasion that might be the important point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SULLIVAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5413) to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code, pursuant to House Resolution 560, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include a letter dated February 8, 1946, to which he referred; and also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include three editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for this afternoon be transferred to next Wednesday afternoon following the special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MAKING PERMANENT THE APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS OF CERTAIN GRADES IN THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. MAY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and General in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in

the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 4, and the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as officers appointed under this section are entitled to receive while on active duty."

"Sec. 3. The President is hereby authorized, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to the permanent grade of admiral in the Coast Guard any individual who shall have served as Commandant of the Coast Guard, with the grade and rank of admiral, after March 21, 1945, and before August 14, 1945. Any officer appointed under the provisions of this section shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by section 3 of the Act of March 21, 1945 (Public Law 20, Seventy-ninth Congress); and any such officer who has been or may hereafter be retired or relieved from active duty shall be entitled to have his name placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him on the active list or while on active duty, and shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances while on the retired list as officers appointed under this section are entitled to receive while on active duty."

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
By W. R. A.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The Senate bill authorized the appointment to the permanent grade of Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy of any individual who had served in that grade after December 14, 1944, and before August 14, 1945. The House amendment authorized the appointment to that permanent grade of any individual who had served in the grade after December 14, 1944, and prior to December 14, 1945; and had the effect of making one additional individual eligible for appointment to such permanent grade. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 4: The Senate bill provided that any of the officers appointed

thereunder who are retired or relieved from active duty after the bill becomes law would be entitled to certain benefits while on the retired list. The House amendment provided for granting those same benefits to officers appointed thereunder who may have been retired before the bill becomes law. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 3: The Senate bill provided that officers appointed thereunder to the grades of General of the Army and Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy should, when retired, receive the full pay and allowances which they received while on active duty. The House amendment provided for paying them, when retired, 75 percent of base pay and 75 percent of the personal money allowance to which they are entitled while on active duty. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: The Senate bill provided that any officer appointed thereunder to the permanent grade of general in the Marine Corps should, when retired, receive the full pay and allowances which he received while on active duty. The House amendment reduced the retired pay of such an officer to 75 percent of his base pay and of his personal money allowance. The House amendment also (1) authorized the appointment to the permanent grade of admiral in the Coast Guard of any individual who had served as Commandant of the Coast Guard, with the grade and rank of admiral, after March 21, 1945, and before August 14, 1945; and (2) provided for paying him, when retired, 75 percent of his active duty base pay and personal money allowance. The conference agreement accepts the action of the House in authorizing appointment to the permanent grade of admiral in the Coast Guard but provides that officers appointed to the permanent grades of general in the Marine Corps and admiral in the Coast Guard shall, when retired, receive the full pay and allowances to which they are entitled while on active duty.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and general in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War, and that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I see the ranking member of the Military Affairs Committee present. Is this satisfactory to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is a matter, I may say, on which all the conferees agreed; it is a unanimous report.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman will tell us briefly what the conferees agreed to before we consent to this unusual procedure? The gentleman is going to explain the conference report, anyway. Why not explain it now?

Mr. MAY. The principal thing in issue in the conference between the Senate and the House was the question whether or not the pay of these high-

ranking officers of the Army should be three-quarters or full pay. The Senate was absolutely adamant on it, there was no chance to get an agreement without going along with them on that. They yielded to us on three different propositions, and we had to yield to them on that?

Mr. COLE of New York. The House position was to grant 100-percent retired pay?

Mr. MAY. Seventy-five percent.

Mr. COLE of New York. And the Senate insisted on 100-percent retirement pay?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. The House conferees yielded to the Senate on that point. The Senate yielded to the House on what points?

Mr. MAY. The Senate yielded on three different propositions. The House had included Admiral Waesche and another officer, and then, in addition to that, the House adopted a little amendment here which changed the date fixed in the bill from July to August.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the House changed the provision and included the months from August to September in order to include one of the great admirals of this war, Admiral Halsey, who became a five-star admiral in that period.

Mr. COLE of New York. The bill as it passed the House included the Commandant of the Coast Guard, but now the Commandant of the Coast Guard has been excluded?

Mr. MAY. No, he has not been excluded. The Commandant of the Marine Corps has not been excluded either.

Mr. COLE of New York. In looking over the title of the bill, I noted it only covered the General of the Army and Fleet Admiral of the Navy and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mr. MAY. It covers all of them.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does it include the Commandant of the Coast Guard?

Mr. MAY. It does.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have exercised very wise and sound judgment. These men have rendered an outstanding service during the recent war and, in addition to that, there is the consideration that they will be available by our Government for important assignments. With the economic security that is given them, the remainder of their life will be such that they will be subject to call for these important missions. As an illustration of that, we can take the case of General Marshall who was recently sent on a very important assignment. We can never tell when there will be future assignments for him elsewhere or for some of these other men. It is a very fine investment for our country and it gives a very deserved recognition to these men.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have no disagreement whatever with the action taken by the conferees.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know that.

Mr. COLE of New York. In fact, what has been recommended by the conferees, in my opinion, is little enough compensation for the great services these men

have rendered. They are deserving of far greater than the reward provided by this bill. I just wanted to make sure that I had some slight understanding of what the conferees had done.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to show that there are many important assignments to be made and almost any time something may arise in which one of these men could be utilized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is recognized for 40 minutes.

OUR ECONOMIC PROBLEM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is at present taking place a great world contest between democracy and dictatorship—between freedom and totalitarianism—between the self-government of, by and for an enlightened people and the autocratic rule of a few over a people kept in ignorance. The prize in this contest is the adherence to one system or another of the peoples of the world.

All men desire freedom.

Therefore the world's allegiance will go to the system of free government if a reasonable degree of security for the people is achieved and if the dynamic expansion and growth which have always been the boasted economic counterparts of political liberty are not lost.

The whole future depends then upon whether or not we can, in the United States, get on top of our economic problems well enough and pursue a policy of sufficient vision so that our citizens—all of them—can be reasonably certain of a good living and work to do, and so that our industry and agriculture can cast off their present fear of abundant production, fear of so-called surpluses, fear of their own full efficiency.

Long ago, as we Americans reckon time, John Adams, the second President of this Republic, said:

All the perplexities, confusion and distress in America arise, not from defects in its constitution or confederation, not from want of honor and virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation.

The words are even more true today than they were when Adams uttered them.

Our problems today center around our fears—fear of inflation, fear of debt, fear of failure of the market to absorb the goods we want to produce.

It is with these three fears that I shall deal in this speech.

OVERCOMING THE FEAR OF INFLATION

There was a time when inflation could have been prevented. That time is past. It was at the beginning of the war. Had we determined then to tax heavily enough to pay for the war currently, we should have had no inflation problem. But we did not.

We failed to pay for even half the cost of the war out of taxes. The other half we paid for in two ways. One way was by honest, true borrowing—the borrowing of the savings of the people, the sale to the people for money they possessed because they had earned and saved it, of Government bonds. This accounted for about 58 percent of our present national debt. As such it represents potential buying power in the hands of the people over and above their current earnings, which is and will remain inflationary buying power probably for a long time. But at least this portion of the national debt increase had the virtue of not increasing the amount of money in existence in the Nation. The other 42 percent of our national debt hangs about the necks of the American people for a very different reason. That amount—about \$105,000,000,000 in all—is held by the banks, including \$22,000,000,000 held by the Federal Reserve banks. These Government interest-bearing obligations were bought by the banks with money they created on their books for the express purpose of using it to buy the bonds. It cost the banks nothing to create this money except a little fountain-pen ink. But because the banks have been and are allowed to usurp the essentially governmental power to create money—albeit in the form of demand deposits—they now have the American people \$105,000,000,000 in debt to them. This part of the debt never should have been debt at all.

If any money was to be created to help fight a war for national survival, it should have been done by the Congress or an agency thereof, and without a cent of capital debt or interest connected with it. But this was not done. Instead we inflated our currency—inflated it to the amount of over \$85,000,000,000. We permitted the banks to create that much new money and put the Nation that much in debt to them for no service rendered in return. We permitted this because we failed to tax enough to pay for the war. No wonder then that average

bank earnings for all national banks in the year 1945 were almost 10 percent of all their capital funds—10 percent, not of capital stock alone, but of capital stock plus surplus, plus undivided profits. For example, one of the very largest of the Nation's banks made earnings of \$59,000,000 on a total of \$300,000,000 of capital funds.

No wonder either that inflation is not a danger but a present fact with which, for a time at least, we have got to learn to live as best we can. We more than doubled the amount of money in existence in the United States of America from 1941 when we had \$78,000,000,000 of cash and bank deposits to 1945 when we had \$163,000,000,000. Either this backlog of demand will never be spent or else it will bring inflation when it is spent.

There are only two possible cures for inflation—taxes and production. A vast increase in production can enable us to catch up with the inflation of our money supply over a period of time. And courageous taxation now could partly make up for our failure to prevent the inflation when we should have prevented it—namely during the war. It could also help reduce the national debt.

There are three courses we can take. The first is to keep OPA and other agencies of control forever in order to prevent price inflation from resulting from the money inflation which has already taken place. Or we could tax all or most of the deferred savings out of the hands of the banks and the people and devote it to paying off a part of the debt which was caused by our failure to tax before.

The first of these alternatives is so alien to American tradition that it must be rejected, although I do not believe we can or should abolish OPA until supplies of goods have been increased to a level well above anything we had prewar. The second, or taxation alternative, while economically unassailable is politically quite impossible, though I hope for enough courage in Congress so that we will at least not reduce further the net Government revenue.

The third alternative, therefore, is the one that we must take. It is a mixed proposition. It requires the maintenance of high tax rates, but recognition that that will not be enough. And then it requires a willingness to face courageously the necessity of gradually absorbing the inflationary pressure of \$163,000,000,000 of money seeking to be spent. It must be borne in mind that this can never be done by means of current production at any prewar price level. For current production will, itself, generate about 90 to 95 percent enough buying power to purchase what is being currently produced. Theoretically current production generates enough buying power to afford a full demand. In practice it always falls short. For prices include not only those costs which are distributed in wages, salaries, dividends, and profits, but also reserves and depreciation accounts, business taxes, and other items that do not get into the buying-power stream. But current production will generate almost enough new

buying power to buy all that is produced. So where are the billions of deferred buying power or savings to find goods to buy—this year, next year, or any other time? Only if there is full production over a long period of time and only if we deliberately seek to bring production and money supply gradually into line with one another can the inflationary pressure of these large savings be controlled. So if we are not going to pass a law saying no one can spend his savings at all, as I assume we are not going to do, we have to adjust the incomes of the people of the Nation upward in line with the facts of the present situation. And some prices, including a good many farm prices, will have to be allowed to rise somewhat, also. In this process we must keep sufficient controls to prevent the movement from getting out of hand, but accept it meanwhile not only as inevitable but as a certain means of bringing about the constantly expanding rate of production upon which our salvation mainly depends. Incidentally, we shall by this process be reducing the real burden of our huge debt by the amount of the reduction in the buying power of the dollar which takes place. If I correctly understand it, the recent price-wage announcement of the President is basically along these lines. The only question is whether it contemplates as much flexibility as the situation really demands, either as to wages or as to prices.

Most of our present difficulties are arising not alone because we are in a period of adjustment and reconversion but also because of a lack of understanding of certain of the fundamental, and I am afraid, irresistible economic forces which are now at work. We cannot solve this problem by looking back at the years after the First World War or even to the ones just before World War II. Since a continuance of well-distributed high mass buying power must in this age of superabundant production possibilities be the key to our economic policy, the first task is to make certain that the income levels of the people are sufficiently high. From this point of view, wage increases become not a danger but rather an economic necessity and the only question is whether increases of 15 to 18 percent are going to be enough. As a matter of fact those increases should for the time being be primarily calculated to prevent any decline in the standard of living of the people and even to make an allowance for a reasonable increase in that standard. I think, however, that few people will question the fact that wage and salary workers in America would be altogether willing to compromise the issue on the basis of an approximate 20-percent increase in unit rates of pay. Now, having once arrived at a fair basis of what wages and salaries should be, it becomes necessary to view the matter of prices from a realistic rather than a theoretical point of view. And it is self-evident that a fair price for any product is that price which covers the cost of production and leaves a fair profit for the producer whether he be a manufacturer, a farmer,

or who he may be. I believe that the workers of the country as well as all other elements in the population believe that American business is entitled to a fair margin of profit. There will be many cases where wage increases can be granted without any increase in prices; but where this is not the case it is necessary that everyone know that necessary price adjustments can and will be made.

Now there are a few facts regarding the relationships of production, prices, and money supply which must be borne in mind. Let us take money first. In 1834 we had one-sixth of a billion dollars of cash money or its equivalent in bank deposits in the United States. Today we have approximately 1,000 times that much money plus bank deposits, or \$163,000,000,000. On a per capita basis we have about 120 times as much. We have five times as much money—including bank deposits—as we had at the end of World War I and almost three times as much as we had at the top of the boom in 1929. It took our Nation 158 years to build up a money supply of \$78,000,000,000 which we had at the end of 1941. In the 3½ years which followed, that is up until July 1945, we added \$85,000,000,000 more by the process of permitting the banks to create money which means that we more than doubled the money supply of America between 1941 and 1945. Under these circumstances it is idle to talk about wage and price levels in terms of prewar figures.

The figures I have just given should prove conclusively that prices do not necessarily tend to increase anywhere nearly as fast as the supply of money increases. In the 100 years from June of 1845 to June of 1945, the money supply of America increased over 100 times per capita while wholesale commodity prices only doubled. This, of course, was due to vast increases in production. However, it is incontrovertibly true that the volume of production moves up and down in the same direction as the volume of money. Indeed, the graph line of production follows the money line either up or down as slavishly as a shadow follows a man. Carefully prepared records show that changes in the money line occur from 2 to 6 months before changes take place in the level of production. The fact of the matter is that today we have a sufficient money supply in America to buy even at the price levels that would probably pertain on the basis of the policy I am advocating, approximately twice the volume of goods that we bought in 1929. We ought not to be preventing farmers from staying in business of producing essential food supplies for America because of too inflexible a price policy. Neither ought we to prevent by the same means a full production of manufactured commodities. Let me say once again that I am far from advocating the abolition of the OPA. I shall vote for its continuance beyond June 30 of this year, but I believe a more realistic policy is absolutely essential and I think the keynote of that policy must be that expanding production is the all-important need of the Nation. All the factors

are present today which can make possible a tremendous production increase provided only we overcome our fear of higher incomes for the people on the one hand and our fear of reasonable and necessary price increases in cases where they are essential to bring about production. Everyone knows that we cannot expect to support and pay interest upon, let alone reduce, our present staggering debt unless we have high production and high national income.

It is my firm belief and vigorous contention that many of the problems connected with labor disputes which we have faced could be readily solved if only we would approach them from the standpoint of the policies which I am attempting to set forth in this speech.

PROSPERITY AT PRESENT DEPENDS ON INCREASING
DEBT—THIS SHOULD NOT BE

Now it has been, as I see it, a crime against the American people that we have saddled them with \$105,000,000,000 of utterly unnecessary debt to the banking system by allowing the present unsound monetary system to continue. But since our money supply is, in fact, tied under that system inextricably to the volume of our debt, the increase in the debt has at least had the virtue of giving us so great increase in money supply as to make it almost inevitable unless we are to be incredibly stupid that we shall, for a period of years, be able to have an unprecedentedly high rate of national production and income. This huge money supply sparked us to a gross national production of \$200,000,000,000 in 1944. It can remain at that rate or only slightly less if we but want it to.

At this point I want to prove by the use of a simple chart that American production, employment and prosperity depend directly under our present monetary system upon the volume of our debt.

The fact is that under the present monetary system of the United States it is impossible for us to sustain prosperity without an increase in debt, public or private, or both. If we examine the figures on total production on the one hand and total debt on the other during the years we will find that total debt of the United States increased from \$86,100,000,000 in 1917 to \$124,300,000,000 in 1920. Production during those years remained relatively constant. They were prosperous years from an economic point of view. Beginning in May 1920, however, there took place a new course of deflationary action on the part of the Federal Reserve Board consisting in part, as will be remembered, an increase in the discount rate to 7 percent. Consequently the debt increased only very slightly during the balance of 1920 and during the year 1921. The economic results of that were to cause the index of industrial production to fall from 75 to 58, 100 points being the average production for the years 1935 to 1939. Thereafter the debt commenced to increase again and increased steadily until the end of 1929 when it reached a point of \$173,400,000,000. In the year 1929 our production had increased to 110 points on the index of industrial production,

which is used here. In the next year the debt did not decline but held its own only. Nonetheless, production dropped a total of 19 points and continued to drop precipitously as will be remembered until the trough of the depression in 1932.

Thereafter, as the result of Government borrowing the total debt, public and private, began gradually to increase, not very rapidly, but gradually, and since it was Government debt that was increasing, and hence the expenditure of the money was usually siphoned into the hands of the rank and file of the people of the country for immediate expenditure, the effect of that debt increase was more dynamic on the economic system than is the case with an increase in private debt. In any event, production climbed under these influences to 113 points in 1937. In that year, however, another decline in the increase in debt took place. The debt did not decline very much, being a decline from \$159,500,000,000 to \$158,000,000,000 in that 12-month period. Production, meanwhile, fell off from 113 points to only 89 points due to that slight reduction in the debt. The war began, as will be remembered, in 1939, and from that time on our debt, public and private, skyrocketed; so did our production, until we reached the fantastic total of \$200,000,000,000 of gross national production in the year 1944 and approximately that same amount in 1945.

I submit these figures only to show that our money supply is the thing that makes possible increases in production, that induces increase in production; that it was the fact that there were almost unlimited amounts of money available to pay for the goods that was the means of getting the tremendous war production which we obtained, and to point out, in the second place, that there is great necessity for a change in a monetary system which makes it necessary for debt to increase in order for sustained production, employment, and prosperity to be possible. We have to cut the Gordian knot that ties our supply of money to our debt in order to be able to assure ourselves of continuous prosperity without increasing our debt at the same time.

This condition cannot be permitted to continue much longer. Our supply of money must be divorced completely from its present bondage to debt. For otherwise we can neither have full production nor even ward off a devastating depression without still further increasing our already staggering mountain of debt.

Hence there remains two problems about which I must speak. They are the fear of debt and the fear of failure of the market. I shall take the second of these first.

OVERCOMING OUR FEAR OF FAILURE OF THE MARKET

It would appear at first glance that there should be no need to fear failure of the market, considering the colossal supply of money that is available. But that money is far from equitably distributed through the population, and as we have seen, a tremendous percentage of it belongs outright to financial institutions. Furthermore, if we are to pursue the policy of upward adjustment of both

wages and prices, which is the only way out for us, we have to make a great effort to do justice by the elements of the population who will be economically harmed by such a trend. These are the people living on fixed incomes. They are also the people whose buying power is most likely to fall and who, therefore, are most likely to cease to be an effective part of the market for expanding production. In general there must be an attempt to bring about increases in white collar workers' income. The Government can set an example by promptly passing legislation giving a reasonable increase in pay to Government workers. From every viewpoint the pay of men in the armed forces, the allowances for their dependents, and the compensation rates of disabled veterans should be increased. The largest group of people attempting to live on fixed incomes are those either now covered or who ought to be covered by the Social Security Act. If their incomes could be adjusted to the new levels a major step would have been taken toward general equity.

The Social Security Act is at present only a partial and inadequate measure. It covers only a portion of the population and provides only meagerly for some of them. The first step should be to greatly broaden the Social Security System so that it will include old-age-retirement pensions for all older people in the Nation who have reached the age where their employment in industry becomes generally difficult and at times virtually impossible. Just what this age should be ought to be determined by general economic conditions, but it is probable that it should not be older than 60 years. Coverage should be universal as to all persons in receipt of incomes less than a certain amount who have attained the retirement age. The amount of the old-age pension should be enough for a life of decency and self-respect, substantially above the present level.

In addition, the act should be broadened to include reasonable provision for all disabled persons and should not be limited as at present to the blind.

In the third place, the aid to dependent children ought to be broadened and increased so that it would be true that a mother deprived of a breadwinner in her family could devote herself to the care of the children without being compelled to support them economically at the same time.

The volume of production of food by American farmers is abundant, both in good times and bad. In the name of justice, therefore, action must be taken to maintain a market for agricultural commodities which will be somewhere near commensurate with the supply of food. We must never again permit hunger and farm "surpluses" to exist side by side. The House has just passed a bill making provision for financing the purchase of what otherwise would become surplus food commodities and making them available to local school districts for school lunches for undernourished children. This could be made part of the social-security program.

Under these circumstances, the Social Security Act would really constitute what the name implies—a thing it does

not do at present. It would provide protection against dependence in old age; it would provide aid to the disabled among the population; it would protect the American home; it would protect the health of children. From an economic point of view, however, a broadened national insurance program of this sort would constitute a means of maintaining the general buying power of the Nation through the years and would become not only a social-security system but an economic-security system for the entire country. Furthermore, this plan would not interfere in the slightest degree with the self-dependence of any able-bodied American citizen in the productive years of life. It would not increase the power of the Government by one iota but would be a means of passing economic power on to millions of citizens in the purchasing power that they would consistently receive.

The crucial point in this proposal, however, is found in a method of financing the system which will make it possible to use it as a means of regulating and evening out the flow of demand in the country. And here I am talking not only about overcoming the fear of failure of the market, but also about overcoming the fear and menace of debt. Since this program would be of benefit to the entire population, it should be basically financed by a broad general tax similar to the so-called Victory tax levied during the war. There should be reasonable exemptions high enough to cover the minimum amount necessary for a basic standard of living, but no other deductions from gross income should be allowed, excepting this basic exemption. The rate of tax should be fixed so to finance the entire system in times of prosperity and reasonably full employment and to provide some surplus in addition at such times. The present is such a time and the operation of the system I am here proposing would therefore have a counter-inflationary effect as well as bringing about a fairer distribution of income. But then it should be provided in the act that the tax would be lowered or eliminated entirely, if necessary, in times of threatening deflation, falling prices, and unemployment. Thus with the out-payments continuing at a time like that we would be equipped with an automatic device for increasing the purchasing power of the country in an orderly fashion at the time when such action was needed to assure continuing employment.

The question arises as to how the necessary funds would be provided for out-payments under these circumstances. The first part of that answer is that any surplus accumulated in the fund would be used first. But the second part of the answer is that since the economic problem of the Nation would be one of matching potential production with equivalent buying power in the hands of the people, the Congress itself would be entirely justified and correct in authorizing the creation of a sufficient volume of new money or national credit to maintain the out-payments of the national insurance or social-security system in lieu of tax revenues. Instead of permitting the private banks to create

the new money needed to expand purchasing power at a time of threatening deflation and then compelling the Government of the Nation to borrow that new money back from the private banks at interest, it is here proposed that the Government create the new money itself in the first place. This would not be inflation because the money would be used by the recipients of social-security benefits for the purchase of goods in process of production, which goods would otherwise go without a market. The new money would only be the means of warding off deflation and depression and of maintaining the price level at a reasonably stable average. Thus, the national debt need not be increased by a single dollar under this proposal.

If we are sincere in wanting to maintain freedom in our economic system, we have to have the means of preventing a failure of the market or mass unemployment in the future. The program here proposed would go a major distance in accomplishing that purpose by itself. It does not rest upon any further increase in the national debt, nor upon any unwarranted invasion of the realm of private enterprise by Government. Neither does it involve discretionary decisions by Government agencies, nor an increase in Government power. The only place where governmental decisions would be made would be in the reduction of the tax rate, and certainly this is a measure to which no one will object.

Action to curb monopoly power, to develop the natural resources of the Nation for the common welfare, to maintain a decent basic level of minimum wages in the country, to prevent precipitous declines in farm prices—all these would be required in addition. But the basic problem of maintaining an adequate flow of buying power in the markets of the country at all times would have been largely answered. And that is the one basic necessity if there are to be good jobs and steady ones for the veterans of America's wars, and if we are to meet successfully the tremendous problem of economic adjustment which our country now faces.

Perfect justice cannot possibly be done in the present circumstances. The all-important consideration is a dynamic expansion of production. Upon that our whole future depends. It must come first.

OVERCOMING THE FEAR OF DEBT

The third fear from which we suffer is the fear of debt. I have already indicated certain specific measures that should be taken to divorce our flow of money or buying power from the increase in debt. But I am not through. As a means of controlling inflation it is, above all things, necessary to check the further creation of new money by the banking system. This can be accomplished effectively by a measure long overdue in the interest of sound banking itself. It also happens to be a measure which could, in effect reduce by approximately one-third to 40 percent the present national debt of the United States. If we really want to control this inflation, we will proceed to institute the 100-percent reserve system for demand de-

posits in the banks. We will require the banks to go back into the banking business of accepting deposits of pre-existing money and making loans and investments with it. As the banks do this, we will attempt to get the Government out of this business. But we must likewise, in the interest of our country, in the interest of controlling inflation, in the interest of solving the problem of debt, get the banks out of the Government's business of creating money. At the present time the holdings of all the banks of cash and Government securities is substantially in excess of the total amount of their demand deposits. If we permit the Government bonds to be counted as part of the required 100-percent reserves, we would freeze these bonds in the bank vaults and prevent their becoming a base for a further multiple expansion of bank credit money. For the time being, the banks could receive the interest, but since the bonds would, in effect, have been monetized as part of reserves, therefore, when they came due, they could and should be replaced with cash money created by the Government without capital debt, interest charge or taxes. This money would take the place of the bonds as part of the 100-percent reserves in the banks behind all their demand deposits. Then we would be safe from uncontrolled inflation. Then every bank in the Nation would be forever safe from runs or failure. Then we would have reduced our national debt to manageable proportions and have lifted a tremendous and, as I have explained, completely unjust burden from the backs of the American people.

Let us take back the Nation's birthright and solve the debt problem as we do so. It used to be contended that the Nation had to pay the banks for their costless manufacture of money in order to keep the banks going. With bank earnings at 10 percent of all capital funds, such an argument becomes ridiculous. If there ever was an appropriate time to correct the gross inequity of our monetary system, that time is now.

There is one group of people who, I confess, would be hurt by my proposal. They are the people depending wholly, or almost wholly, upon the income from Government bonds. The real value of their interest receipts would be cut down. But there is no way of avoiding this. The reason so many bonds were sold—namely, our failure to tax to pay for the war—is the reason the bondholders now have the bonds they do. It is also the cause of the fact that we cannot protect the real buying power of interest without wrecking the country in the process. Furthermore, if we follow the course I have charted, we shall be able to have and to indefinitely sustain a high level of production and national income. And that will mean that the bonds will be good, that they will be paid—even though in dollars of somewhat lessened purchasing power. And as a means of easing the blow upon these people, I would favor permitting a reasonable amount of Government bonds to be used by any individual to purchase a schedule of annuity payments for his protection in the future.

In any case, there are times when the truest conservatism may sound radical. For they are times when nothing will suffice except going to the roots of our problems. I have not dealt with all of these in this speech. I could not. The great problem of monopoly I have not directly discussed. But I have tried to give a rational answer to what I believe are the great fears from which our Nation now suffers so far as our domestic problems are concerned. I hope I have offered substantial hope that these fears can with understanding and courageous action be overcome.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED CHURCH SERVICE CENTER, NEW WINDSOR, MD.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from yesterday's Washington Sunday Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives of this great Nation of ours a work that I think is deserving. I feel that a brief accounting of it should well be spread upon the pages of our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the Washington Sunday Star of yesterday there was a story about the relief center at New Windsor, Md. This began as the headquarters of the Brethren Service Committee. Last October it was taken over by the interdenominational church committee on overseas relief and reconstruction, sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The Brethren leadership, however, remains. This relief center was begun by one of those denominations that are known as the peace churches. They comprise the Quakers, Mennonites, and the Church of the Brethren. It is part of the doctrine of these churches that they refuse, under all circumstances the taking of life. Many members of this group were conscientious objectors during the war and World War I.

I rise now to point out the work they have been doing during the war and particularly since the war ended. It is in line with, and justifies their reasons for, resisting the taking of life. They have lost no opportunities to help. The work they are now doing as churches and as individuals is the restoring of life to the suffering of the entire world. I think it is commendable. They are not alone, of course. Practically every one of our American churches—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish—are taking an active part in the relief of the suffering around the globe, but these folks are very active and have led the field.

I shall include with my remarks an article by Carter Brooke Jones which appeared in yesterday's Sunday Star. I think he has written it very well, and I think it delineates very well the nature and scope of their service.

Last fall it was my pleasure to show seven boys from my own district around

the Capitol here. They had lunch with me. They had the pleasure of meeting the Speaker of the House down in the hallway. It was a very pleasant experience for them. They were on their way to Poland with a shipload of heifers and horses, a practical expression from the people of America. They were volunteers—as is most of this service. They were taking livestock over there that had been donated. It is refreshing to observe that we can assist others and do so without forever charging it to the taxpayer through appropriations. They went to Poland, and I am glad they did because those boys saw suffering and understood it in the only way it can be understood. It has to be seen. It was a valuable experience for them.

The churches in my district thought that livestock did not fit in too well; that they were a fruit-producing country; so in my district the Brethren Church has bought an old abandoned brick school house near Wenatchee, Wash., and set a canning center up there. It is their intention to can surplus fruits and vegetables for overseas relief that otherwise would be wasted. Our markets are long distances away and there are surpluses at harvest time. It is their intention to make their contribution to the relief of Europe and elsewhere in that way—a very practical approach. As is the case out here at New Windsor, as is revealed by the story in the Star, the cannery in my district will also be operated by volunteer labor, and its over-all operation will be sponsored by the Wenatchee Valley Church of the Brethren and the other participating churches of that area.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America have three centers of operations. The first one is at New Windsor. There is another center in this relief work of the Churches of Christ in America at Nappanee, Ind., and another at Modesto, Calif. It is a very practical thing when you get down to it—the serving of mankind by each of us. We try to do it through our political channels here in the House of Representatives. But it becomes impersonal, and therefore not as effective as it should. It is just an appropriation. It is much better when relief and succor is given to suffering people through the medium of a nonpolitical agency. I hope that the people of this Nation will encourage, support, and commend always such works as these.

[From the Washington Star of March 17, 1946]

NEW WINDSOR—WHERE 150 MEN AND WOMEN TOIL FOR THE SUFFERING MILLIONS
(By Carter Brooke Jones)

NEW WINDSOR, Md., March 16.—On a hill-top that towers above this western Maryland village muffled voices and a sound of hammers break the quiet of a hazy spring day.

Within a labyrinth of old buildings, a cobbler repairs shoes. Women cut cloth into patterns. Men and women pack boxes. A truck pulls tortuously up a steep road.

Seven miles away a young man pulls a reluctant heifer out of a barn for inspection.

Down in the valley the town postmaster tugs wearily at so many parcels that it might have been Christmas.

On a railroad siding a freight car is being loaded with strange haste, while the dis-

patcher looks at his watch and remarks that they'd better hurry—the fast freight'll be along in 20 minutes.

It's all part of a pattern.

SCHOOL CLOSED AFTER 104 YEARS

The buildings on the hill housed generations of students at Blue Ridge College, which finally closed its doors in 1943 after 104 years. It's doubtful whether many people outside of this section of the country ever heard of the college or of its little town of New Windsor. Even today there are Marylanders who don't know where New Windsor is.

But homeless Poles, destitute Czechs, hungry French, Germans, and Dutch are staring every week at boxes that bear in bold stencils: "From the United Church Service Center, New Windsor, Md., U. S. A."

There will be many thousands who will never forget New Windsor.

For here on this old campus, the Protestant churches, some 30 denominations, have united in a relief project which is sending a steady stream of desperately needed things to Europe and Asia—clothing, food, seed, dairy cattle.

At this headquarters, where you can look across a vast stretch of valley to the jagged haze of the Blue Ridge on the horizon, Christianity has become more than principle and precept. It has been translated into action.

These workers, young and old, men and women, boys and girls, are obeying the kindly mandate: "Bear ye one another's burdens." Nearly all of them are volunteers.

ONE OF THREE UNITED STATES CENTERS

When the little college gave up a long financial struggle in 1943, the campus was bought at auction by the Church of the Brethren. Later the Brethren service committee set up a relief center. Members of this faith ran it so efficiently that last October it was taken over by the interdenominational church committee on overseas relief and reconstruction, sponsored by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. New Windsor became one of three centers in the United States for the collection and distribution of supplies. The others are at Nappanee, Ind., and Modesto, Calif. New Windsor probably is best known among the churches, and bundles have come here from every State.

"New Mexico was missing," said C. L. Angell, the harassed but willing freight agent for the Western Maryland Railroad, "but sure enough, a car came in from there the other day."

The campus houses about 150 volunteer workers. They have come from more than 20 States, offering their services for a few days, for weeks, or even months. Every week end, boys from Western Maryland College at Westminster, only 7 miles away, come to put in a day or two helping out. Church workers have come from Washington, Baltimore, and many other places. But there's more than enough work for all, and more volunteers are needed, especially those who can stay a while.

Members of the Brethren Church, having started the project, still are prime movers in carrying it forward. But many faiths are represented.

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

No one asks those who drop in the help exactly how they interpret the Book of Genesis or whether they believe in infant baptism or favor total immersion at a later age. They're asked only, "Can you help? How long can you stay?"

Selective Service has assigned about 75 conscientious objectors to the center, and these youths are eager to serve here. Officials say they are invaluable.

The volunteers have included college professors, laborers, farmers, artisans of every type, ministers, lawyers, engineers.

There is, as just one example, Miss Elouine Arnold, of Washington, who got a leave of

absence from her job with a typewriter company to come here and work in the office for 5 months—for no compensation except the satisfaction of helping the helpless.

Sometimes a whole group will come from some community to stay a week or a month, sewing, sorting, baling up clothing, and otherwise lending their hands to whatever is needed.

Amish women in organdy caps give a colorful touch to the work rooms and the cafeteria.

There is Anna Karicofe, a missionary, who is working here while she awaits her return to north Africa. Rudy Sailor, a farmer from Illinois, looks, with his long chin whiskers, like a portrait of an old-time Dunkard, as the Brethren once were called. And Mr. Sailor, sorting shoes for victims of the war, has given much else to the cause of his country. His son was killed in the Pacific.

WORK MARKED BY EFFICIENCY

One who had not inspected the center might think that a group of workers haphazardly would turn out that sort of work. The contrary is true. The project moves with quiet efficiency from start to finish. No wasted motion is apparent. The workers have been provided with the latest equipment, and they operate it so effectively that three to four carloads of clothing and a car of food move out every week. During one recent week, seven carloads left for the docks in Baltimore or New York, but that was a record week.

The clothing is sorted and baled in the school gymnasium. Under a torn basketball basket, a baling machine of the newest design pressed the garments into compact bundles, which are wrapped in paper and burlap automatically and sent down a chute to waiting trucks.

Efforts are made to obtain gifts of clothing in good repair. Repair work except on shoes, no longer is done at the center. If torn clothing does arrive, however, it is not discarded, but sewing kits are enclosed when it is shipped, so that the recipients can mend it.

Shoes are in a different category. If they are salvagable, they are welcome. The center has a complete a repair shop as you'd find in any city. Shoes are soled, heeled, and mended until they come out looking new. Hundreds of pairs are renovated and boxed every week.

Many of these shoes will be taken eagerly by the homeless, the displaced persons, as they are called, who have dragged themselves through northern winters with sacks wrapped about their feet or only papers, perhaps.

CANNED FOOD IS BOXED

Canned food of all sorts is donated and this is boxed and consigned to places abroad where it is needed most.

On the day this reporter visited the center, 120 cases of seeds were ready to go out. These seeds are for vegetable gardens, to help those with a little land to grow their own food.

There were 32 varieties of seeds in the shipment. There are about 60 potential gardens in each case and each garden is designed for six persons.

The seeds are divided among the various countries needing relief, with due care taken to send to each only those varieties suited to its soil and preferred by the people.

Many churches and charitable organizations buy cloth and send it to New Windsor. Here it is cut into patterns, most for children's clothing. These are returned to the organizations that bought them. Women of church circles and other groups make the completed garments and return them to the center for final shipment.

More than 200 bales of clothing move out of the gymnasium every day. There are 400 to the carload. Each bale weighs 100 pounds and costs \$5.90 to make up. This expense includes labor, materials, transportation, office overhead, telephone, telegraph, and warehouse rental.

Hundreds of fine dairy cattle are being donated to the farm for shipment overseas. The center already has shipped 1,200 heifers to Poland, France, Greece, Belgium, and Czechoslovakia. A new shipment of 350 head is about to go to France.

HERDS GO TO NEEDIEST

B. G. Bushong, livestock representative of the project, explained that the dairy herds are going to places where the need is most urgent. Thus some have gone to orphanages in France and to tuberculosis sanitariums in Belgium. Others have gone to Polish families without any farm animals at all. Some blue-ribbon bulls have gone to Greece to help replace destroyed herds.

Workers for the United Church Service Center go along with the cattle to feed them aboard ship and see that they reach their destinations.

This little capital of mercy even has a mimeographed newspaper, the *Weekly Processor*. It is edited by Charles (Chuck) Webb, director of education and publicity. Mr. Webb's wife works in the pattern room. Mr. and Mrs. Webb are awaiting assignment to the European end of the project, which is the World Service Committee, an organization of the World Council of Churches.

The center has its own carpentry and repair shops where crates are made for shipping food and other materials and machinery is repaired. An electric cutting machine is the feature of the cloth pattern room.

The town of New Windsor, which was a tranquil foothill community of 500, has almost doubled its population since the enterprise was expanded to Nation-wide proportion, and the village stirs with activity unknown through its century-plus history.

The freight agent has become one of the busiest on his whole line. Postmaster William D. Lovell handles 250 incoming sacks of parcel post every week. He used to take in around 40. There's talk of raising the rank of his postoffice from third to second class.

VISITED BY MANY CHURCHMEN

Noted churchmen drop in from all over the country—clergy and laymen—to see how the relief work is going. They leave with pleased comments.

The Federal Council of Churches hesitated at first when it was suggested that it sponsor a national relief program. Officials wondered whether they would be duplicating or overlapping the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Then they did some checking and decided all it could do and all their organization might do would only begin to meet the need. So they went ahead.

The relief shipments of the Protestant churches are made in close cooperation with UNRRA. Routes and destinations are worked out through UNRRA.

John D. Metzler, director of the United Church Service Center, formerly was a school teacher.

He has seen some moving letters from organizations and individuals in Europe, telling what relief shipments have meant.

Mr. Metzler calls New Windsor the center of the Ecumenical Movement in America at the moment—meaning the movement toward the unity of Christian churches.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GREGORY (at the request of Mr. BATES of Kentucky), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. BLOOM (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 10 days, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 19, 1946.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 5555, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, and for other purposes. To hear REA Administrator Claude R. Wickard.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

On Tuesday, March 19, 1946, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will consider private bills H. R. 4725, H. R. 5634, H. R. 5598, H. R. 5200, H. R. 4958, H. R. 4254, H. R. 5278, and H. R. 4672.

On Wednesday, March 20, 1946, the committee will proceed with hearings on H. R. 3663.

The hearings will begin at 10:30 a. m. in room 445, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Committee on Flood Control will begin hearings on an omnibus flood-control authorization bill on Monday, April 8, 1946, at 10 a. m. The hearings will continue daily except Saturday up to and including Friday, April 19.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, April 9, 1946, at 10:30 a. m., to begin hearings on projects to be reported out in an omnibus river and harbor authorization bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1142. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize additional permanent professors of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1143. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the payment of additional uniform gratuity to reserve officers commissioned from the status of aviation cadets; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1144. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close Van Ness Street between Connecticut Avenue and Reno Road NW.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1145. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1146. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, according to law, the information that the lease which expired November 26, 1945, which lease is held by Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., was renewed beyond its initial time; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1739. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy shore activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 430. Resolution to authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of the disposition of the case against certain individuals charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation with espionage and possession of confidential Government documents; without amendment (Rept. No. 1748). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 563. Resolution authorizing the expense of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1749). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 564. Resolution providing compensation for employees of the Committee on the Civil Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1750). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 565. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4873, a bill to create an Agricultural Credit Agency, to consolidate therein all Federal agricultural lending agencies, to create a public farm-appraisal system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1751). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2239. A bill to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural-rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 5433. A bill to amend section 540 of title 10 and section 441 (a) of title 34 of the United States Code providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 286. An act for the relief of James F. Desmond; without amendment (Rept. No. 1717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOOK: Committee on Claims. S. 401. An act for the relief of sundry fruit growers of the State of Delaware who sustained losses as the result of the fumigation of apples with methyl bromide in order to comply with the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture relating to the Japanese beetle quarantine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 983. An act for the relief of A. F. Crawford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1184. An act for the relief of A. L. Clem and Ida M. Bryant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1319. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Condon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1721). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1411. An act for the relief of Alfred Osterhoff, doing business as Illini Reefer Transit, Champaign, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1722). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1622. An act for the relief of Gordon Cole Hart; without amendment (Rept. No. 1723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. S. 1840. An act for the relief of the Danvers Shoe Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Henry R. Butler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1725). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Edith Popwell; with amendment (Rept. No. 1726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1852. A bill for the relief of R. H. White Transfer & Storage Co., of Nashville, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1919. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Mills; with amendment (Rept. No. 1728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2188. A bill for the relief of George W. Bailey; with amendment (Rept. No. 1729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2569. A bill for the relief of Daphne Webb; with amendment (Rept. No. 1730). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2576. A bill for the relief of William F. Schmeitz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1731). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2665. A bill for the relief of Acchille Guillory and Olivia Guillory; with amendment (Rept. No. 1732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2747. A bill for the relief of George A. West; without amendment (Rept. No. 1733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2926. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Breon; without amendment (Rept. No. 1734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2973. A bill for the relief of Ben Thomas Haynes, a minor; with amend-

ment (Rept. No. 1735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3007. A bill for the relief of Russell F. Taylor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3125. A bill for the relief of Lovie M. Trotter; with amendment (Rept. No. 1737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3160. A bill for the relief of George Corenevsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 1738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3329. A bill for the relief of Ralph H. Lemon; with amendment (Rept. No. 1739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3341. A bill for the relief of J. E. and Minerva Mitchell, and Rosie Monroe; with amendment (Rept. No. 1740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3432. A bill for the relief of J. W. Edgerly & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HEDRICK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3434. A bill for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1742). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3470. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Willie Lamb and Edgar Lamb; with amendment (Rept. No. 1744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3676. A bill for the relief of Pershing W. Ridgeway; with amendment (Rept. No. 1745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3770. A bill for the relief of Lyndon T. Montgomery; with amendment (Rept. No. 1746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 5796. A bill to amend title II of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit the making of contributions, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for the maintenance and operation of certain school facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 5797. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance credits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act for military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 5798. A bill to recognize and reward distinguished war service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5799. A bill transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter

fisheries, from the Department of the Interior to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 5800. A bill to authorize school districts in Alaska to issue bonds for school construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 5801. A bill to provide that time spent as prisoners of war in World War II by Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard officers and enlisted personnel shall be computed as double time for all purposes under any provision of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 5802. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 5803. A bill to amend the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 so as to authorize appointment of navigators and observers as commissioned officers; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 5804. A bill to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma for the Indians of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. J. Res. 326. Joint resolution directing the Federal Power Commission to inquire into and report to the Congress on various matters with respect to atomic energy for nonmilitary use and purposes of peace; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution providing for a declaration of policy with reference to occupation of enemy territory and the appointment of a joint committee to determine personnel requirements in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution providing for a declaration of policy with reference to occupation of enemy territory and the appointment of a joint committee to determine personnel requirements in relation thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5805. A bill for the relief of James Harry Martin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5806. A bill for the relief of Etta Yoakam; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5807. A bill for the relief of Arthur H. Cooper and Charles E. Cooper; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5808. A bill for the relief of Vertie Bea Loggins; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

H. R. 5809. A bill granting a pension to Jennie Christiansa Rohrbacher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 5810. A bill granting a pension to Robin R. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 5811. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of David Owens, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 5812. A bill for the relief of the Silver Fleet Motor Express, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5813. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Iola Veach; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5814. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Torr Allyn; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1709. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Dr. J. T. L. McNew, vice president for engineering, Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, Tex., favoring House bill 5517; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1710. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of 60 citizens, protesting against House bill 1362; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1711. Also, petition of the Lions Club of Edgerton, Wis., Robert H. Stricker, president, petitioning Congress to include the sum of \$50,000 in the Agriculture appropriation bill for 1947 to establish a forest research center in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1712. Also, petition of W. W. Beeman for the Wisconsin Association of Scientists, urging adoption of the McMahon bill, Senate bill 1717, and rejection of the May-Johnson bill, Senate bill 1463; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, light of all that is true, strength of all that is good, glory of all that is lovely, we lift our anxious eyes from the swiftly changing scenes of earth, which so perplex us and dismay us, that we may see again in Thee the wisdom, the serenity, the power, and the love sufficient for our needs.

As toils and turmoils testing our jaded spirits wait with each day's duty, so, blessed be Thy name, at noontide stand these gates of peace that open to a holy shrine of prayer. Here we bow utterly alone, bringing each a life stained by sin yet strengthened by trial, sobered by failure yet rejoicing in hope, and enriched by friendships. Possess us with Thy passion for purity and peace, purge us by Thy cleansing fire, that for this troubled day we may be the faithful servants of Thy redeeming will. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 15, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTICE OF SPEECH BY SENATOR PEPPER ON PEACE AND AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, to those who may be interested I should like to announce that immediately after the

Senate convenes tomorrow I shall seek recognition by the Chair to speak, with the candor which I believe the gravity of the situation requires, about peace and America's foreign policy.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 396. An act providing for the transfer of a certain fish hatchery in Comanche County, Okla., to the city of Lawton, Okla.;

S. 1162. An act to convey certain lands to the State of Wyoming; and

S. 1185. An act to change the designation of Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, in the State of Montana, to Custer Battlefield National Monument, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1425) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.," approved June 8, 1940, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1354) to authorize the permanent appointment in the grades of General of the Army, Fleet Admiral of the United States Navy, and General in the Marine Corps, respectively, of certain individuals who have served in such grades during the Second World War.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 301) to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2947. An act to authorize the consolidation of lands on the Sisseton Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3139. An act to authorize the Coast Guard to investigate and employ new methods of promoting safety at sea and aiding navigation;

H. R. 4230. An act to provide necessary officers and employees for circuit courts of appeals and district courts;

H. R. 4512. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research relating to psychiatric disorders and to aid in the development of more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4914. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation, and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or

near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill.," approved December 21, 1944;

H. R. 4940. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Old Saybrook, Conn.;

H. R. 5271. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II;

H. R. 5316. An act to repeal the law permitting vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes;

H. R. 5317. An act to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park;

H. R. 5407. An act to grant to the Federal Works Administrator certain powers with respect to site acquisition, building construction, purchase of buildings, and other matters;

H. R. 5413. An act to accept the renunciation by Albert W. Johnson of pension under section 260 of the Judicial Code;

H. R. 5544. An act authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.;

H. R. 5654. An act to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Bureau of Reclamation;

H. R. 5716. An act to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. J. Res. 304. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1946, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution to authorize the making of settlement on account of certain currency destroyed at Fort Mills, P. I., and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 301) to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FILED DURING RECESS

Under the order of the Senate of the 15th instant,

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5400) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, reported it on March 18, 1946, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1067) thereon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters which were referred as indicated:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the administration of the Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agriculture (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF A CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on a certain oil and gas lease, the terms of which had been extended under the provisions of